

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

CHAPTER 19

LITERATURE AND SOCIETY

GAVIN TOWNEND

I. DEFINITION OF THE PERIOD

While the age of Golden Latin is accepted as straddling the late republican and Augustan periods, the division between these two is particularly arbitrary, with no satisfactory date to set as the boundary – neither the death of Cicero in 43 B.C. nor the victory of Octavian in 31. Sallust survived into the 30s, but is properly classified as republican on the basis both of subject-matter and of attitudes; Nepos, still alive several years after Actium, likewise looks back to the last period of the Republic and shows no real affinity to the new age; Marcus Varro produced a great part of his work during Cicero's lifetime and his *De Re Rustica* in 37/36 B.C., although he was still writing when he died in 27, the year when the name 'Augustus' appeared, to distinguish the new era beyond doubt. On the other hand, within a year or two of 40 B.C. the emergence of Octavian Caesar as champion and saviour in the first *Eclogue* establishes Virgil as an Augustan from the start; while the fourth of the series, for all its puzzles, is already looking into a future of peace and prosperity. The dedication to Maecenas of both *Epodes* and *Satires* 1 attaches Horace openly to the imperial entourage, even if the decisive poems belong relatively late in the decade. The 30s are in every way a period of transition, in literature as in politics. The two previous decades had seen the great advances of Catullus, Lucretius and Cicero, the last with his expressed determination to make Latin literature the equal of Greek in every department. In the 20s a confident professionalism manifests itself, with the major theme of patriotism flowering in the Augustan peace and with unthreatened leisure for the romantic games of elegiac and lyric poetry. The lessons of Cicero's mastery of language for a whole range of literary purposes are available for application to poetry and prose alike, without yet becoming stereotyped as technique replaces original imagination, but with *ars* matching *ingenium* even more completely than Cicero had observed in the work of Lucretius.

Yet from the start imagination had its limitations. The emulation of Greek models so desired by Cicero was to lead inexorably to the summing-up by Quintilian towards the close of the following century,

with parallel lists of writers in Greek and in Latin, carefully arranged according to their genres and set before the reader as models for *imitatio* in the pursuit of rhetorical excellence. This avoidance of innovation and failure to welcome the concept of change is paralleled in Roman politics and life in every period. Iulius Caesar had outraged the establishment, at least, by preparing to change the shape of the state as arbitrarily as he changed the Roman calendar. The 'Roman revolution' of Augustus owed much of its success to the extent to which change was concealed under the cover of 'restoration of the Republic', and insistence on precedent was emphasized at almost every stage under the early Principate. Throughout three centuries of imperial development, there was apparently never a moment when an emperor or a political theorist so much as contemplated the suitability of the machinery of government and society to its changing function and attempted to lay down the pattern for a fundamental revision. In a very similar way, literary criticism is essentially conservative, with *imitatio* as a basic presupposition: first the transference into Latin of forms and ideas derived from the Greeks; then the recognition of a Roman master in the relevant field, whether a Lucilius (one of the few genuine innovators), a Cicero, a Cornelius Gallus or a Virgil, and an attempt to adapt his achievements to new themes and new demands; and all the time compliance with the rules of the genre, one of a limited number with names revealing their Greek origins,¹ and on a lower level with the conventions of such forms of expression² as the *propemptikon* (farewell to a traveller), the *soteria* (thanksgiving for safety), the *kletikon* (invitation) and others less clearly named or defined.

Only the genre of satire has no formal Greek model and no Greek name – indeed no secure Latin name either, until the tradition started by Ennius' *satura* prevailed over Horace's preferred and clearer title of *sermone*s (conversations). At the same time the rules of the genre were established almost as firmly as those of almost any other, allowing that an inherent formlessness was part of the tradition; so that dactylic hexameters were prescribed, as already sometimes in Ennius and always in Lucilius after his early experiments. This was at the cost of excluding that eccentric alternative tradition known as 'Menippean', characterized by the total lack of formal rules to the point of mixing prose with verse in all sorts of metre. Quintilian could not help recognizing this variant, as introduced by so reputable a writer as Varro; but the examples which have come down to us in fragmentary form from the Neronian age, under the uncertain titles of *Apocolocyntosis* and *Satiricon*, are not acknowledged by Quintilian or any other critic of the classical period.

¹ Quintilian gives a full list and discussion of the Greek genres at *Inst.* x.1.46–131.

² For a full list (perhaps unjustifiably full), see Cairns 1972 (A 13), esp. Ch. 3.

The exclusion of satire from the canon of regular genres is marked by its admission into Latin of Greek words and phrases, a licence shared by those two minor genres never fully recognized by the Greeks although invented by them, the epistle (whether in prose or in verse) and biography. The true Greek genres are accepted by the Latin writers without real question, and there are only minor attempts to cross the boundaries between them and to form such hybrids as Hamlet's 'tragical-comical-historical-pastoral', which still show the dominance of the classical categories. It is rare for a major writer to go as far as Virgil does in borrowing formal elements from tragedy to relate the story of Dido, and from Callimachean epyllion to describe Evander's reception of Aeneas on the Palatine. Once Cicero, Virgil and Horace were securely established as paragons in their different fields, their influence was paramount; and even in the Silver Age, starting with the death of Augustus and running on well after the disappearance of his descendants, reactions against the masters, such as those of Seneca and Lucan never escaped from dependence on the genre.

II. PATRONAGE AND ITS OBLIGATIONS

The social position of literature at Rome, never as fully integrated into the life of the city as it had been at Athens during the fifth and fourth centuries, changed markedly after Actium, when oratory lost its pre-eminence with its divorce from a genuine political function. Already at the end of the second century B.C. the function of drama, whether tragic or comic, seems to have been greatly diminished, as the population became too big and too cosmopolitan to provide the common cultural background necessary for a mass audience.³ Drama survived, so far as it did, simply because of the major reputation of tragedy and comedy among classical genres, and revivals may have depended for their appeal largely on the spectacle.⁴ There is virtually no evidence that the contemporary tragedies written by Q. Cicero, Caesar or Asinius Pollio ever reached the stage or were even intended to.

Instead, literature becomes more and more the property of an elite, as Horace repeatedly emphasizes.⁵ Writers had never expected direct financial returns from the sale of their works, so long as there was no possible system of copyright or royalties; and men like Terence, of provincial origin and low rank, had attached themselves to prominent figures in society, without any apparent loss of creative independence. Even Lucilius, financially secure and proud of being his own man, took

³ It is far from clear what sort of performance actually filled the theatre in Rome and outside. In Augustus' reign they certainly handled scripts in Greek and Oscan (Suet. *Aug.* 43.1, etc.); cf. Rawson 1983 (F 55) 97-113. ⁴ E.g. Plut. *Luc.* 39.5.

⁵ E.g. esp. *Sat.* 1.4.70-5, 137-9, 10.72-92.

pleasure also in being a close associate of Scipio Aemilianus, and did not object to devoting two or three of his satires to attacking his patron's political enemies, while confident of freedom from reprisals. Of the major writers of the last generation of the Republic, Cicero, Varro and Catallus had no need of literary patronage; the position of Lucretius and his possible dependence on C. Memmius remains mysterious.⁶

During the years from Philippi to Actium, political protection was perhaps more important; and the writer is traditionally pictured as dispossessed of his property and as welcoming the patronage of a great man for financial security at least. This tendency is perhaps accentuated by the fact that the great majority of writers, both in the Augustan period and throughout the following century, came from outside Rome, from the towns of Italy proper (Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid), from the old province of Cisalpine Gaul (several of the earlier neoteric poets, Cornelius Nepos, Virgil, Livy, and in due course the two Plinies), from southern Gaul (Cornelius Gallus and perhaps Tacitus a century later), or from Spain (the two Senecas, Lucan, Columella, Quintilian, Martial). But most of these men of letters appear to have enjoyed comfortable means and independent position, and to have fully assimilated into upper-class Roman society, with traditional Roman ideas and standards.

Not dissimilar was the position of Greeks, now rivalling Italians in the equestrian civil service, as the authors of extensive prose works in their own language. None of these comes from old Greece: Dionysius of Halicarnassus combines orthodox and respectable literary criticism with antiquarian history, evidently to present Rome to the Greek-speaking world, in Rome and in the provinces; Nicolaus of Damascus stands sufficiently close to Augustus to exploit the emperor's own apologia in the composition of his highly favourable biography, and then attaches himself to Herod the Great as a spokesman for the king and his people; Diodorus from Sicily writes voluminous if uninspired history, as does Strabo from Pontus, now known only from his geographical work. These men hardly need to be counted as 'Augustan writers', however important their work may have been in making the new era acceptable to the hellenistic world and cementing the unity of Greek and Roman after the rift in the 30s. Some time later, Philo of Alexandria, well known for his activities as a spokesman for the Jews under Caligula and Claudius, but mainly concerned with arguing the connexion between Greek and Jewish philosophy, belongs almost exclusively to his own hellenistic-Jewish society; but the Greek epigrammatist Lucillius, largely interested in music and drama, must have some claim as part of the literary scene of an emperor as philhellene as Nero. But, outside the field of diplomatic activity, where Greek oratory found a new and increasing role in the

⁶ Cf. Wiseman 1974 (B 197A) 26-39.

mouths of envoys from provincial communities, the dependence of any of these men on the support, financial or otherwise, of Roman patrons is impossible to determine.

The picture is much clearer for the most prominent of the Augustan poets. Horace, son of a freedman and starting badly by fighting for the losing side at Philippi, became an accepted member of Maecenas' well-defined circle and was able in due course to give up his post as *scriba* and to settle down as a small country gentleman with a modest apartment in the capital. The later offer of the post of secretary to Augustus himself seems to have been rejected rather from aversion to regular employment than from any fear of subservience to the emperor's wishes (Suet. *Vita Hor.*). Virgil, losing his family estate near Mantua, sought and gained the support first of Pollio, a distinguished writer himself and an independent politician, and then of Maecenas to restore his position and presumably to promote his literary career. He appears to have given up his connexion with the north and lived for the most part near Naples (Suet. *Vita Ver.*). Financial considerations were to some extent involved in these and other cases, even if the claim to poetical poverty in Tibullus, as in Juvenal in the second century, is nothing but a literary convention. But the main objective appears to have been status and connexions.

It is hardly now believed that Maecenas (and still less Messalla, as patron of Tibullus and others) actually prompted the composition of particular works for quasi-political reasons, apart from such *pièces d'occasion* as Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*, written in 17 B.C. for a specific religious festival and with an obvious political aim; nor that Livy, close to the imperial family though he was and possibly financially rewarded for his help to the young Claudius in composing history, needed official direction to make him an active defender of ancient traditions and values, such as Augustus admired and wished to propagate.⁷ In fact, Livy was notorious for his republican sympathies and particularly for his support of the memory of Pompey, which excited Augustus' comment but did not lead to the withdrawal of his friendship.⁸ We certainly fail to find the sort of subservience which might have been expected of court poets. In the light of what we know of the war of propaganda which developed between Antony and Octavian during the late 30s, before Actium and probably earlier, it is noteworthy that there is no sign of the poets' involvement in this campaign. Even in Horace's *Satires*, where Lucilius had provided some precedent for attacking a patron's enemies, Antony appears only once (1.5.33), with an oblique reference four lines earlier to *aversos amicos* to be reconciled by the envoys, and there is no trace of criticism or hostility. In the diplomatic purpose of the trip to Brundisium, on which Horace and Virgil accompanied Maecenas,

⁷ Syme 1959 (B 177); Walsh 1974 (B 191A) 5-6.

⁸ Suet. *Claud.* 41.1, Tac. *Ann.* IV.34.3.

Horace assumes complete lack of interest. Again in the *Epodes* (vii and xvi) he twice laments the civil strife of the period without any suggestion of partisanship or idea of solution, while in the first of the series, whether written for the expedition against Sextus Pompeius or Antony, Horace gives no hint that the temptation to accompany Maecenas was due to anything but personal affection.⁹

The *Eclogues* were a less likely medium for expressing political views, and Virgil does no more than address Octavian, unnamed but unmistakable, as patron and protector in the first poem; while in the fourth contemporaries may have been more confident than we can be of the extent to which Octavian, or indeed any specific individual, was the subject of hopes or praise. In the *Georgics*, once peace had been established, Octavian can be hymned as the greatest of benefactors, deserving the title of godhead in the same way as Lucretius had honoured Epicurus for his blessings to mankind (v.7ff); and in III.16 Virgil promises a new poem centred on 'Caesar' as if on a god. Yet it is difficult to see how the four books, with their periodic outbursts of depression leading sometimes to despair, can be regarded as the sort of propaganda for an officially inspired revival of agriculture that historians used to claim they were.

When the next work came to be written, Virgil may have been aware that Augustus (as he now was) wanted a national epic to indicate the position of the *princeps* in a re-born Rome and an extended empire, together with an exposition of the moral values on which the new age was to be based; but it cannot be supposed that the *Aeneid* was in any way what had been suggested or expected. The term 'propaganda' fits awkwardly here,¹⁰ despite the explicit recognition in three major passages (I. 286-96, with its notorious ambiguities, VI. 791-805, and VIII. 671-728); and there are all too many passages which appear to question the full worth of the leader's triumph. An epic intended simply to glorify and justify the character and victories of the ideal ruler, with Aeneas in some degree representing and prescribing the pattern of the just and self-sacrificing *princeps*, as Virgil's hero appears to do, could have reached the conclusion of the conflict against his rival without a savage killing, which, however acceptable in the context of heroic warfare and however justified in terms of statecraft, still has to be carried out in the madness of rage and revenge.¹¹ The great majority of contemporary readers, like the majority since then, will have been sufficiently carried along by the force of the narrative to accept the death of Turnus as dramatically and morally appropriate; everything we can infer about Virgil indicates that he can

⁹ *Contra*, du Quesnay, in Woodman and West 1984 (B 204) 19-58.

¹⁰ Cf. the dismissal of the dichotomy 'poetry or propaganda?' in the Epilogue to Woodman and West 1984 (B 204) 195.

¹¹ *Aen.* XII.946-7, 'furiis accensus et ira terribilis'.

never have been happy about this resolution of the problem. Likewise, the inflated praise of Augustus' young nephews and son-in-law can properly be seen as a tribute to the *princeps* and his bereaved sister Octavia, as if the poet might hope thereby to gain favour; but the fact that Marcellus' death concludes and crowns the long pageant of the glories of Rome suggests that what matters most to Virgil in the end is the price paid for military and political triumph and the irredeemable sorrow for the death of a young man.¹² A whole-hearted panegyric of the Augustan achievement, however full of hope for the future, did not require both its halves to end in such a minor key.

The failure of Horace to realize what might have been expected of the laureate, who could produce the *Carmen Saeculare* and hymn the victories of Drusus and his brother in *Carm.* iv.4, is more obvious and less demanding of explanation. The Roman odes of the third book are full of noble sentiments and an expression of true Roman virtues; but they hardly add up to the direct propaganda that has often been seen in them. All too often, as in iii.4, overt praise of Augustus drifts off into the poet's private reactions and his addiction to wine and girls; while private odes on themes of self-indulgence and the shortness of human life not only predominate in the collection but are commonly felt to reveal Horace at his most effective. We appear to have another Augustan spokesman who can hardly be held to have produced exactly what the Augustan age demanded.

This leads to a question which is especially pressing in connexion with the opening decades of the Principate: the tendency of poets to propound a set of values totally at variance with the major programme of moral reform whereby Augustus was hoping to bring Rome back to the greatness of earlier centuries. Respectable private and public behaviour, the marriage of Roman men to Roman women, the production of true Roman children to fight Rome's wars and carry on the traditions of 700 years – these are the most obvious of the ideas on which the Julian legislation and Augustus' own injunctions sought to base the new society of citizens. Of the poets who might be expected to promote these ideas, Virgil never married, and seems to have had homosexual inclinations, if any. Horace likewise remained celibate, although he gives the impression that he followed the Epicurean practice of sexual indulgence with women and boys indiscriminately to work off natural needs when they arose, as first Lucretius and then the satiric spokesman of *Sat.* i.2 had recommended. This may be merely the convention of the genre, but Horace nowhere attempts to suggest anything else – certainly not that he ever contemplated any sort of permanent union.

For the three elegists, things are no better. Tibullus and Propertius, as

¹² vi.868–86, with Otis 1963 (B 135A) 303–4.

poets, are romantically inclined bachelors, Tibullus expressing affection for boys no less than for girls; as men, they may have had wives and children. The anonymous life of Tibullus is too fragmentary to establish his marital status, unless by negative inference, although Pliny's friend Passennus Paulus (*Ep.* VI.15) appears to have claimed direct descent from Propertius. Whatever may be the truth of that, their love-poetry is as extramarital as that of Catullus, without ever a hint of true love leading to marriage or to possible divorce and the infringement of the rules of class. The only claim to paternity in the whole of Augustan poetry is Propertius' negative assertion (II.7.14) that he would produce no sons to fight Rome's wars – no sons at all, indeed, for this is no pacifist manifesto – and that the emperor's wishes have no validity in the context of love. Ovid is even worse. He married three times and, like Augustus, produced one daughter, the only attested child of any major republican or Augustan poet; but his poetry reveals a still more irresponsible rejection of the Augustan ideal. In the *Ars Amatoria*, as already in the *Amores*, he describes a world devoted to philandering and promiscuity. In particular, he pays what must have been a most unwelcome tribute to the age of Augustus and its moral climate, when he declares (*Ars Am.* III.121–2), 'I congratulate myself on being born now and no earlier: this age is suited to my way of life.' On this reckoning, the new *pax Augusta* had produced the circumstances for an unworried self-indulgence, quite unaffected by the emperor's pronouncements and legislation aiming at the restoration of old-fashioned values. This attitude of Ovid's ('*prisca iuvent aliis*') must have been largely responsible, perhaps even more than his questionable complicity in the intrigues of Augustus' granddaughter, the younger Julia, for his banishment to the Black Sea in A.D. 8 – the clearest example known to us of a decisive punishment visited by Augustus on an offensive writer, and one never revoked by his successor.

In his attempts to secure his recall from exile, Ovid indulged to some extent in the sort of flattery which becomes more and more noticeable as the Julio-Claudian age advances. In Tiberius' reign, Velleius Paterculus, while evidently paying due credit to the emperor's earlier successes as a military leader, clearly expresses himself in stronger terms than the truth required.¹³ Poets in the following reigns were guilty of increasing servility, often revealing a tendency to build up the achievements, or at least the promise, of a new emperor by blackening the name of his predecessor. There is some evidence that the same is true of some of the lost historians of the Julio-Claudians, such as Servilius Nonianus and Cluvius Rufus, if not of the more solid annalists, Aufidius Bassus and the

¹³ E.g. II.94.1–3, 124.1–3; but see Woodman 1977 (B 202) 54–5; Goodyear in Kenney and Clausen 1982 (B 95) 639–40.

elder Pliny.¹⁴ Certainly Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* (if that is the proper name of the *Ludus de morte Claudii*), mocks the dead Claudius and exalts the young Nero in a way which appears to illustrate the development of the historical tradition from reign to reign. Even the very fulsomeness of flattery may sometimes have suggested an element of irony which rather implies mockery – a device which many have seen in Catullus' praise of Cicero in poem 49. The subtlety which this technique would require means that today we can never confidently assess the poet's sincerity.

Flattery must necessarily have occupied a great amount of the oratory which was delivered during the period, if Pliny's surviving *Panegyric* provides a fair example for this earlier part of the century. But that speech, delivered in A.D. 100 under Trajan, is the first we possess in full since the death of Cicero. The considerable fragments of Claudius' speech delivered in A.D. 48 on the admission of Gallic notables to the Senate and preserved on a bronze tablet at Lyons, reveal the antiquarianism of the speaker, who knows that he does not need eloquence or cogency to gain his point. Tacitus, who claimed that the role of oratory had virtually ceased with the end of open discussion under the Republic (*Dial.* 40–1), gives his own version of the same speech, with considerable freedom, but reproducing the same qualities accurately enough (*Ann.* xi. 24). We cannot tell whether other speeches from the period inserted in the *Annals* are as closely related to the speaker's recorded words; but it is noticeable that the most powerful come from men of independent mind upholding their own ideas of freedom – ideas which interested the historian far more than any speeches which have simply approved of the emperor's policy. Thus we have a speech from M. Terentius (vi. 8), protesting against the doctrine of guilt by association; from Cremutius Cordus (iv. 34–5), defending the rights of the historian; and from Thrasea Paetus (xv. 20–1), upholding the old values of Roman administration by Roman magistrates. The eloquence may be Tacitus' own, interested to emphasize the voices of independent spirits. In any case, there is a significant, and probably deliberate, link with the republican ideal of unfettered rights to express one's beliefs and act according to one's conscience, without ever proposing any genuine reform of the imperial system or expressing concern for the great majority of people whose interests might be affected.

This ideal, harking back to the heroic names of the younger Cato, of Brutus and Cassius, appears to have provided a continuous focus for discontent among senators throughout the first century. We lack Tacitus' account of the debate which followed the murder of Caligula, when the abolition of the Principate was allegedly debated for the first and last time; but hostility to tyranny, if not to autocracy, plays an active

¹⁴ G. B. Townend *Hermes* 88 (1960) 98–120, 89 (1961) 227–48.

part in the literature of the period. The actual expression of this hostility in the political field is regarded by Tacitus as fruitless and exhibitionist (*Agr.* 42.4-5); and he puts similar words into the mouth of Tigellinus, which he himself might not totally disclaim, blaming Stoicism for this truculence and mischief-making (*Ann.* xiv.57, supported by *Agr.* 4.4-5).¹⁵

Thanks to the loss of all of Livy's later books, we can form little idea of his treatment of the rise of Augustus to supremacy; but nothing suggests that he expressed hostility to the new settlement. Velleius Paterculus, to be discussed below, is too deeply devoted to Tiberius to reveal any reservations, and Curtius Rufus, writing his history of Alexander the Great apparently under Claudius, steers well clear of all but the most conventional reference to the contemporary world. Of the other main writers who recorded the reigns of the various Julio-Claudians within a few years of their deaths, Aufidius Bassus, Cluvius Rufus, Fabius Rusticus and the elder Pliny, we can infer little except that they provided a steady annalistic record of events and a great deal of highly hostile anecdote to be used by Tacitus, Suetonius and Cassius Dio. There is no trace of any sort of republican sentiment, except in Cremutius Cordus, of whom we know at least that his remarks about the republican heroes, Brutus and Cassius, offended Tiberius enough to lead to prosecution and the ineffectual destruction of his works, which survived to gain a reputation for freedom of expression, and the surprising approval of Caligula (*Tac. Ann.* iv.34-5; *Suet. Calig.* 16.1). Titus Labienus, an outspoken orator and historian, shared the same fortune, without apparently expressing any positive republican views (*Sen. Controv.* x *pr.* 5-8).

In practice, the 'Stoic opposition', while confined to a small group of interrelated families, appears to have been sentimental and ineffectual, with Stoic language often playing no more significant a part than much of the traditional Christian language does in the literature of recent centuries in Britain. But Stoicism is still prominent in Latin literature of the Silver Age which follows Augustus. The Stoic concepts which feature in Manilius' astronomical poem are a feeble attempt to match the glowing Epicureanism of Lucretius, without any sort of credibility or cogency. More importance can be attached to expressions of hostility to Nero, as *dominus* rather than *rex*, found in Seneca and his nephew Lucan. Seneca produced a manifesto in favour of the just ruler in the *De*

¹⁵ The word 'Stoic', like the ancient literary terms 'lyric', 'tragic' and 'satiric', must be recognized as possessing a very precise sense in antiquity, deriving from the philosophical school of Zeno (333-263 B.C.) in the Stoa Poikile (painted portico) in Athens, with its rigid doctrines of absolute virtue and duty, of acceptance of divine destiny combined with involvement in public life. In particular, the Roman Stoics expressed opposition to tyranny and admired Caesar's opponents, Cato and M. Brutus.

Clementia, which he wrote for his pupil Nero early in his reign; and the same ideas appear scattered through his other works, particularly in the tragedies, where tyrants from Greek myth are employed presumably to cast light upon the contemporary situation, as some imitator of Seneca did more overtly in the play *Octavia*, written not long after Nero's death, with Nero as the stock tyrant and Seneca as the sage counselling restraint and justice. The whole tradition about Seneca has been bedevilled from the first by the paradox of the declared Stoic preacher, albeit of the new liberal type, who advocated the simple life but possessed immense wealth, which he was alleged to have increased by highly questionable financial practices, and who acted as tutor and then as minister to the unteachable and irresponsible Nero.

Seneca was driven to his death in A.D. 65 for his supposed complicity in the 'Pisonian conspiracy', if not its leadership. This plot certainly aimed at the assassination of the emperor (in the best tradition of the Athenian and republican tyrannicides) and at his replacement either by the unimpressive aristocrat Piso or by the elderly and ailing Seneca himself. So little was achieved that its true details cannot be discovered, if the conspirators indeed shared any common aim beyond that of murder.¹⁶ To judge from Seneca's literary utterances, tyranny was abominable enough to warrant such an action, although he never actually recommends it. The link between philosophical theory and effective political action remains tenuous.

More certainly prominent in the same conspiracy was Lucan, described by his biographer as virtually the standard-bearer of the affair. His motive appears to have been that Stoic opposition to tyranny which features with increasing force in the books of his *Bellum Civile*, after the gross flattery of Nero with which the epic opens, closely matched by the panegyrics of contemporary poets and by Seneca himself in his *Apocolocyntosis* a few years earlier. Despite the claim in 1.33-45 that the civil war was justified as leading to the eventual accession of Caesar's descendant Nero, and despite the evident fascination of Caesar as the natural hero in comparison with the ineffectual Pompey, the poem turns into a clear indictment of Caesarism, with such phrases as 'Caesareae domus series' (iv.823) among the holders of bloody power pointing unmistakably at the latest of the line. But despite this ideological motive, there is reason to suppose that Lucan was primarily inspired by personal rancour from his loss of favour with Nero after he had been so rash as to surpass his patron in poetic skill. In the light of what follows, the flattery in the first book is a prime candidate to be considered from its very excess to be ironical in intention, even before the open break with Nero had taken place.

¹⁶ Griffin 1984 (C 352), esp. 166-70.

It is difficult to know how much consistency we should look for in such a poet, or whether he was capable of any degree of subtlety. To judge by the evidence of Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 56-7), supported by Suetonius, Lucan's Stoicism did not establish his fortitude; for he turned state's evidence at the first threat and incriminated his own mother and several others, before recovering his philosophical principles and committing suicide in the tradition of the republican martyrs and his uncle Seneca. The biography by Vacca ignores all this story of cowardice; while Statius, in his commemorative poem (*Silv.* II.7), contrives to say nothing at all about the circumstances of Lucan's condemnation and death. There is incidentally no reference to his relationship to Stoics in any of these sources. The ancient biography of Persius, on the other hand, makes much of his training in Stoicism and his links with prominent exponents under Nero: he was much more deeply imbued with Stoic ideas and language than Lucan. But neither these ideological opponents of the establishment nor those most inclined to support the imperial system appear to have been able to exploit their convictions to the major advantage of their works, in prose or in verse. Only the two greatest of the Augustan poets found valid inspiration in some of the emperor's ideas and made a significant contribution to the new political order; but their reservations were always striking enough, as we have noted at the start of this section, to ensure that their independence never degenerated into subservience.

III. RHETORIC AND ESCAPISM

In a world where political comment was perilous and profitless and speech-making had no real political function, the development of rhetoric was at once natural and paradoxical. Cicero had not only provided a model for oratory; he had produced a series of treatises which could be the basis of training in all the necessary techniques. The establishment of rhetorical schools for young men of means is more or less contemporary with the rise of the Augustan age, as professionals took over where Cicero had left off in his coaching of aspirant politicians. Much of our knowledge of this training is contained in the *Controversiae* and *Suasoriae*, collections published by the elder Seneca during the reign of Tiberius of the rhetorical exercises performed by teachers and their pupils and preserved as examples of the craft. Stock themes were provided, whether of hypothetical legal problems or of situations from myth or history, which the student was required to develop in his own way, so as to catch and hold the attention of the listening audience and give them something to remember. Originality of expression was all-important, no matter how trite the material; and great value was attached

to the *sententia* as the pithy and memorable phrase, often containing paradox and seldom concerned with real life or with the actual problems to be encountered in the courts or the Senate. Many listeners besides Petronius (*Sat.* 1-2) and Juvenal (I.15-17, VII.150-4) must have suffered from the *crambe repetita* of the same old material, whether served up by the inept or by the intolerably ingenious. But rhetorical training seems to have been more or less compulsory for any young man who wanted to make his way in public life and for many who had no such ambition.

Certainly it shows its influence in most of the surviving literature from the very beginning of the Augustan period. Not a little of Virgil's power can be seen to depend on his absorption of the Ciceronian rules for producing effective arguments, although the technique is never allowed to take precedence. Ovid's *Heroides* display most clearly the young poet's delight in all the devices of rhetoric, which he had learnt in the schools, gaining a distinction on which the elder Seneca comments. The *Heroides* are essentially similar compositions, depending for their success on immense dexterity in saying the same thing in an endless variety of different ways, as heroine after heroine laments her unhappy lot. Much the same is true of many elements in the *Metamorphoses*, particularly the actual descriptions of transformations of men or women into other creatures or plants. The ability to play this game with such unwearying freshness makes Ovid the perfect example of how the techniques of the schools could best be exploited in the most unlikely literary forms.

The vitality and originality which characterizes the literature of the Augustan age declines sharply during the succeeding reigns. In prose, Valerius Maximus, as much a devotee of the rhetorical schools as the elder Seneca himself, produces a series of books containing *exempla* of virtues and vices for the orator to exploit in his own compositions; but he has been unable to resist treating them in the fashionable rhetorical manner, often at the cost of clarity, in his attempt to avoid the monotony which such a catalogue might involve. It must have been very difficult for the aspiring speaker to incorporate such sophisticated material into his own speeches. At about the same time, Velleius Paterculus sets out to relate the history of the world in two books (an understandable reaction to Livy and Diodorus); but the need to cover the same stories, which generations of historians had dealt with in their own ways, constrains him to use all the devices of technique in pursuit of his own sort of originality. He is no master, as Ovid had been; and his account of the Battle of Actium (II.85) illustrates excellently the deployment of ingenious language which fails to leave any impression either of what really happened or of its historical significance. The battle had presumably been dealt with in Rabirius' lost epic and perhaps in Varius Rufus' panegyric of Augustus, as it was by the author of the *De Bello Actiaco*,

which survives in papyrus fragments;¹⁷ even Livy may have found it advisable to treat the subject as an excuse for rhetorical display rather than as an account of tactical moves and individual prowess. After these, and who knows how many other versions, there was little left for Velleius to do except to search for paradoxes as the schools had taught and the fashion demanded.

For the younger Seneca, trained in the manner illustrated by his father's works, the exposition of his chosen subject, philosophy, as a guide to life, a purpose of some weight and significance, continually tended to be dominated by the need to express the same doctrine again and again in striking and memorable phrases. The *Epistulae Morales*, generally regarded as the most successful and attractive of his voluminous works, suffer from something like the same fault as Ovid's *Heroides*: that, no matter how deeply felt, the subjects are so repetitive that they are kept going, up to the grand total of 124, by ingenuity rather than anything else. The same is true of the philosophical dialogues, enlivened though they are by striking *exempla*, as if to demonstrate how Valerius Maximus' anecdotes might be applied to a good purpose. Novelty of expression is the more necessary as Seneca is not searching for philosophical truth, as Plato does, so much as preaching an accepted code, enriched from Epicurus and elsewhere, to assist the reader in coping with the problems of life, and doing so in such a way as to seize and retain the attention by force of language. Apart from modifications of traditional Stoicism, Seneca, like most Silver Age writers, makes very little positive addition to what has been said before.

The nine tragedies which have come down to us under Seneca's name share enough of the characteristics of his prose works to make the slightly uncertain attribution of most, at least, virtually certain. Derived obliquely from Greek tragedies, mostly extant works by Euripides or Aeschylus, they have been totally adapted to the taste of the day, in which stage performance was a minor consideration, if indeed contemplated at all. Stoic doctrines, with the usual love of paradox, colour the speeches of kings, queens, commoners and choruses alike; and the dramatic flow is almost entirely sacrificed to the succession of telling *sententiae*, few of them appropriate to speaker or circumstances. Topics recur in speech after speech in different plays (freedom and tyranny, death as an escape, the wise man's invulnerability), but so skilfully organized that the sameness is at least masked at the first reading. Although limited by the settings of the plays, the ideas and expressions

¹⁷ Cf. H. Benario, 'The *Carmen de Bello Actiaco*', in *ANRW* II, 30.3 (1983) 1656-62. The fragments preserved in fact deal with events in Egypt some time after the battle and exhibit a freedom in imaginative fictions which do not suggest a composition as early as the Augustan age proper.

are much the same as those of the prose works, only made more remote from the reader by transference to the unreal heroic world of Greek mythology.

The same combination of rhetoric and philosophy shows itself inevitably in Seneca's nephew, Lucan; although for him philosophy is not a major preoccupation, but simply a source for ideas and common-places, together with the accepted link of Stoicism with the republicanism which colours the narrative of the *Bellum Civile*. This story, already related in prose by Pollio and Livy, is made the field for the same sort of cleverness as we find in Seneca, with rather too many memorable phrases for more than a handful to deserve remembering, and with almost unlimited skill in making the same ideas sound fresh each time they occur. Lucan's originality lies partly in his choice of a subject from relatively recent history (although almost from the start poets had followed the laureates of Alexander the Great in writing short-lived accounts of Rome's glorious victories or of the achievements of the latest military hero, whether Marius or Caesar, Octavian or Germanicus), partly in his deliberate rejection of the conventional Homeric gods so busily employed by Virgil. This may be regarded as a concession to Stoicism, allowing Fate to play the dominant part rather than the eccentric and partial Olympians.

At least one can find in Lucan enough independence from tradition to grant him a degree of self-confidence hardly to be matched elsewhere in the derivative literature of the period. Our other surviving Silver Latin epics, by Silius Italicus, Valerius Flaccus and Statius, date from the Flavian dynasty; but they continue the general tendencies of the Julio-Claudian writers virtually unchanged, with the same desire for effect, which had begun as early as the major elegists, together with the same sensationalism and bloodthirstiness. All look back rather than forward, with Virgil always at hand as a model: the contemporary world or the future has no part in their scheme. It seems most unlikely that Statius' *German War* cut any new ground, in manner or subject-matter.

There may have been other important poets in the period from Tiberius to Nero, but even their names are lost. We do possess a number of minor poems, some falsely attributed to the young Virgil, perhaps to replace the master's lost juvenilia. These are commonly dated after the death of Augustus, but are essentially continuations of the practices of the great Augustans. None contains a hint of genuine creative potential. More interesting is the group of more or less court poems from the reign and perhaps from the circle, of Nero: pastorals from Calpurnius Siculus and from an anonymous poet preserved in a manuscript at Einsiedeln, quite competent but uninspired pastiches of Virgil's *Eclogues*, though hardly to be mistaken for Virgil, containing considerable florid emphasis

on the golden age of the young Nero and no likelihood at all that their panegyric is ironical. Likewise, and possibly from the pen of these same writers, is the panegyric of Calpurnius Piso, perhaps the patron of Calpurnius Siculus, which essays to praise without relevant material to hand. This ineffectual praise points to a subject as dubious as the supposed leader of the Pisonian conspiracy of A.D. 65, and underlines the lack of valid themes for poetry during this period. What we know of Nero's own poetry on the Trojan War does not suggest that he was concerned with anything but the manipulation of words or hoped to establish any relevance of the Trojan War to his own day.

The reaction against these poetical fashions, especially epic as written by Nero himself, is found in Petronius, rather too intimate a member of the imperial clique for his esoteric criticisms of Lucan and others to be fully comprehensible to us¹⁸ (neither as parody nor as models for improvement do they really make sense). And in Persius, whose charges of vapidness, affectation and effeminacy show at least that he has not got Lucan in mind, there is a strong protest against those who have nothing to say and use fanciful and contorted language to say it (1.32-5, *et alibi*). Yet Persius, setting out to write satire in the tradition of Lucilius and Horace, has chosen an almost impossible course. He declares his intention of using everyday language (v.14, *verba togae*), as his predecessors had done, but his complex allusiveness requires an intimate knowledge of Horace and probably of other writers no longer available to us. His dizzying switch of metaphors and his unexpected linking of words produce a texture which is anything but conversational (as satire or *sermo* had come to expect), straightforward or unaffected. And his material is all from stock: themes and phrases from Horace and the Stoic tradition make up a great part of it. But at least Persius comes closer to touching the heart than any other writer in a period when literature is tending to become a private pursuit to be practised and enjoyed in the sort of group of mutual admirers described by Persius in satire 1 and by Tacitus in *Ann.* xiv. 16, as led by Nero and evidently supported by Lucan before the rupture. Horace and Virgil may to some extent have distanced themselves from all but a very select public by the complexity of their texture and their demands on the reader's knowledge and sensitivity; but they still provided plenty to engage a wide interest, with no reason for anyone to complain of the irrelevance of their poetry to the contemporary world.

One method of finding material for poetry without touching too

¹⁸ The poet Eumolpus (apparently not intended to represent any living writer) utters in *Sat.* 89 sixty-five lines in iambs on the Sack of Troy, as if to combine the theme of Nero's main poem with his addiction to appearing on the tragic stage; and in 119-24 nearly 300 hexameters on the same civil war between Caesar and Pompey which Lucan took as his subject.

directly on the perilous issues of the day, a method already practised by Catullus and followed by the Augustans and on into the Silver Age, was the Alexandrine device of exploiting Greek mythology to provide either examples or actual subjects for poetry. Virgil's use of the Trojan War and the adventures of the Trojan Aeneas to provide an aetiology for Rome and for the Augustan settlement is on a different level (or series of levels) from any other borrowing we are aware of. The use of lesser myths, some of extreme obscurity, by Horace, Tibullus and Propertius to illuminate erotic and other topics in contemporary life, whether seriously or ironically, enriches their poetry immensely, without necessarily adding to the impact.¹⁹ Ovid, after playing with Greek stories similarly in his early love-poetry, turns to myth as a subject in its own right for the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*, largely in order to deal with erotic themes without causing further offence to the moral climate of Augustan reform. With very little serious intention and with all the apparatus of rhetorical mastery, he tells his stories for their own sake and with immense success.

Major Greek myth serves a much more solemn purpose in Seneca's tragedies, a field in which Roman subjects had hardly ever proved effective; although, as already remarked, some fairly close follower of Seneca was before long to devise in the *Octavia* a tragedy built round the efforts of Seneca himself to dissuade Nero from adopting the role of tyrant, and Tacitus (*Dial.* 2-3) reports the immediate impact of dramas on the themes of Domitius and Cato at about the same date. Epic, with the major exception of Lucan, depends likewise on myth, as we see it in the Flavian age with Valerius Flaccus' retelling of the Argonaut story and with Statius on the Theban and Trojan wars. For Silius Italicus the Punic War was very nearly as mythical as the legendary wars of Greece; and Curtius' version of the history of Alexander in prose is essentially part of the same process. Juvenal, in his first satire, laments the tedious dominance of the Greek cycles of mythology, in tragedy and epic alike, and he is supported by numerous epigrams of Martial. Their criticism evidently applies to almost the whole of the first century after Christ.

IV. THE JUSTIFICATION OF LITERATURE

Various reasons were advanced during the period for writing and for reading different sorts of books. For Quintilian, writing on the training of the young orator, almost all literature could contribute to the mastery of rhetorical techniques, even Catullus and Lucretius. He has no place for works which do not belong to the recognized genres, such as Phaedrus' fables or Petronius' picaresque novel.

¹⁹ E.g. Hor. *Carm.* III.11 and 27; Prop. I.20 and *passim*.

Again, as Homer was often regarded by the Greeks as a repository of knowledge on all manner of practical matters, so a whole range of Latin works existed primarily as sources of information. Here Vitruvius *On Architecture* is an accepted example, with no literary pretensions, but demonstrating his practical value when he became a working handbook for Renaissance architects. Mela's *Geography*, limited though it is, could be of some use. Celsus *On Medicine*, as on other branches of knowledge in books now lost, seems to have been properly and exclusively concerned to impart information.

With the agricultural writers, however, Varro's practical application seems largely to be sacrificed to literary considerations, Columella's rather less so; but when Columella completes his treatise with a book in hexameter verse, he is deliberately placing himself beside Virgil's *Georgics*, the practical value of which, whether for constructing a plough, selecting a lucky day for various activities, or replacing a stock of bees, makes no claim at all for serious consideration. Likewise Manilius, following Cicero's translation of the hellenistic Aratus' astronomical poem, is concerned rather to write poetically than to provide genuine information; and it is noticeable that Tiberius' heir, Germanicus, during the same period chose to attempt an improvement on Cicero's *Aratea* as a purely literary challenge. For Quintilian, such didactic poets as Lucretius and Aemilius Macer are classified along with Virgil, as writers of epic, without concern for their subject-matter. It is certainly difficult to regard Grattius on hunting, Horace on poetry, or Ovid on the calendar (and perhaps on fishing) as allowing their subject to take precedence over their art.

The moral purpose of literature, taken over from the Greeks and emphasized in numerous apologies for the time spent on composition, is especially prominent in historiography, where there is a claim that reading about the past will enlighten and improve the quality of life, private and public, in the future; Cicero adds that this interest was not confined to the elite (*De Or.* II. 59-61). There is a similar assumption that the main function of satire is moral, if not precisely didactic. Yet in Horace's *Satires* it is apparent that his primary purpose is neither to attack vice nor to advocate virtue: it is rather to discuss themes, ostensibly moral or not, in such a way as to involve the reader in a humane attitude to life and mankind. Only perhaps in the sequel, the first book of *Epistles*, can Horace be felt to provide specific moral admonishment to his addressee and thus to the reader, as when he encourages Tibullus to count his blessings and enjoy life as Horace does (4.12-16), or warns Celsus not to be too pleased with himself (8.15-17); and even in this book the majority of poems are concerned rather to play round

quasi-philosophical commonplaces. Persius, Horace's successor in the Lucilian tradition, preaches with some fervour the urgent need for moral reform and for escaping from the ties which hinder moral freedom, but in such a way that everything takes second place to style and the striking expression. Seneca, whose philosophical works are certainly less theoretical than practical, uses the epistolary form to exhort his friend Lucilius, and so the general reader, often with a personal reference to his own circumstances and shortcomings which owes something to Horace and contributes a good deal to Persius. The moral dialogues are more remote and less immediately cogent; only the manifesto *De Clementia* appears seriously to aim at prescribing moral standards and political advice to the new emperor Nero. If moral impact is to be sought anywhere in the period, it is to be found most effectively in Virgil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, both ostensibly devoted to quite different objectives, but expressing a view of man's position in the universe and relationship to nature which goes well beyond Augustus' declared doctrine of restoring the morality of Roman life.

The overt declarations of poets and prose-writers alike seldom reveal their true objectives. Horace's division between the *utile* and the *dulce* (*Ars* 343) draws attention to the rarity with which it is claimed that literature exists to give pleasure to the reader – that is, that literature is virtually an end in itself. This view, already apparent in Catullus, ties in with the recognition, most explicit in Horace, that literature is for the elite, a limited number of devotees – for those few who are capable of appreciating the writer's artistry in whatever field he chooses to operate. From this point of view, the moral and erotic themes of Horace, the piety and patriotism of Virgil, the love-affairs in the elegists, the Stoicism and republicanism in Lucan, all form the material which the poet exploits to create different literary masterpieces.

There is a curious conflict concerning the writer's originality: poets continually claim to be the first to strike out a particular line, but this means for the most part a new line in Latin.²⁰ Explicitly or implicitly, there is always the assumption of accepted conventions within which a new work must develop, and the concept of *imitatio* of predecessors is seldom far away, together with the practice of allusiveness to recall the reader to the earlier masters, Greek or Latin, who have provided ideas for the new writer to play with and make his own. This is most evident in Virgil's deliberate evocation of (successively) Theocritus, Hesiod and Homer in his three great works; in Horace's use for the *Odes* of both the early lyricists and the Alexandrians; in the elegists' open acknowledgement of their debts to Callimachus, Philotas, Euphorion and others,

²⁰ Williams 1968 (A 103) 253–267, with (c.g.) Virg. *G.* III.10–12, Hor. *Carm.* III.30.13–14.

whose influence we should recognize if their works had not been wholly or mainly lost.²¹

Most contentious and debatable here is the role of Cornelius Gallus as in some sense the founder of the whole Augustan movement. The discovery in 1978 of a papyrus containing two tetrastichs and fragments of other lines, clearly belonging to Gallus, has done little to clarify the nature of his poetry and the limits of his influence on his successors.²² His influence on the young Virgil especially cannot be doubted, but the precise part he plays in the sixth and tenth *Eclogues* still defies secure definition, while the pursuit of themes and phrases from Gallus in Propertius is a still-growing industry. One feature can be detected, in accordance with previous expectation: the emphasis on the poet's own personality and experience as a major element in his poetry and the development throughout a book of elegy of the course of a love-affair, which was to provide an important bridge between the personal poetry of Catullus (and very likely of other members of his circle) and the 'subjective love-elegy' of the Augustans. This autobiographical tendency in Latin poetry, not necessarily always based on reality, appears to take its origin in the satires of Lucilius, reporting 'the whole of life' according to Horace (*Sat.* II. 1. 32-4); and it developed in Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles* alongside the similar phenomenon in elegy and to a great extent in his own *Odes*. The personal and conversational becomes a characteristic of the greater part of Augustan poetry, although making little impact in Virgil.

An important issue here is the recognition that an intimate knowledge of the poetry of Gallus, and perhaps of other lost poets such as Cinna and Valerius Cato, could be taken for granted by the Augustan poets; and the alert reader would pick up many references and echoes which escape us today. This does not mean that Gallus was regarded as a completely satisfactory model for aetiological or erotic verse – certainly the surviving fragments contain usages which were totally rejected by the next generation. The concept of the master as model seems only to be fully developed after the climax of the Augustan age, when Virgil's pre-eminence is so universally recognized that epic poets feel obliged to follow him more or less closely, unless they take a positive step, as Lucan did, in abandoning all of Virgil's heroic machinery and writing a fundamentally different sort of historical epic. Horace's mastery in lyric poetry, on the other hand, appears virtually to have prevented later poets from attempting to operate within the genre at all; while Statius' two essays in Alcaic and Sapphic in the fourth book of *Silvae* (5 and 7) simply

²¹ Cf. Hubbard 1974 (B 89A) 10-11, 70-81.

²² Anderson, Parsons and Nisbet 1979 (B 4); cf. e.g. S. G. Hinds and R. Whitaker *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4 (1983) 43-54, 55-60; J. Fairbrother, *CQ* 24 (1984) 167-74.

demonstrate that nothing was left for an imitator to achieve. Whatever Caesius Bassus composed to deserve respectful comments from Persius (VI.1) and Quintilian (X.1.96), not a line of his lyrics has survived to show us whether his achievement was worth anything. However justified Gallus' reputation was among the Augustans, at least he never discouraged others from pursuing the tradition he had started.

The importance of earlier writers as sources for ideas and allusions of various sorts was expressly acknowledged in antiquity, as is shown by Macrobius' lists in the *Saturnalia* (especially V.2-22, VI.1-5), which were probably compiled by critics over several centuries, of Virgilian borrowings from Greek and early Latin poets; although it is not clear how concerned these critics were to assess the actual effect of some of these quotations. Modern scholarship has made considerable advances, handicapped by the loss of so many works which were evidently available to Virgil and others. But it has failed to find an altogether satisfactory explanation of the famous echo in Aeneas' address to the ghost of Dido, 'invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi' (*Aen.* VI.460) from Catullus' burlesque, 'invita, o regina, tuo de vertice cessi' (56.39), which in turn presumably reflects a line, now lost, in Callimachus' original poem on the Lock of Berenice, on which Catullus' poem was based: it may be that both come from an unknown predecessor of enough solemnity for Virgil not to feel that the pathos of his own context might be spoiled by reminiscences of Catullus' parody.²³ On the other hand, Virgil strikingly quotes from his own *Georgics* to provide animal-similes for the *Aeneid*, evidently when he wants to sharpen the reader's attention and remind him of elements in the earlier context which have relevance to the later.²⁴

There seems to be no comment in ancient criticism on the major Virgilian symbols which play a prominent and continuous part in certain books of the *Aeneid*, as the snakes and fire do in II, if not throughout all; but the presence and the effect of these symbols can hardly be denied once they are noticed. The reader's attention is likewise demanded, if scholars are right, by the occurrence of key words in Virgil (but also, it has been suggested, in Persius); and on a much larger scale by consideration of the overall architecture of the book of *Eclogues*, of the four *Georgics*, of the whole *Aeneid*, and increasingly complex diagrams have been produced for the books of the elegiac poets, for Horace's *Odes*, and for almost every other book of Latin poetry.²⁵ It may be significant that the greatest of the Augustans have lent themselves remarkably to the requirements of modern research, so that an endless succession of doctoral theses and published monographs can be extracted from more

²³ See R. G. Austin's note *ad loc.* in his edition of *Aen.* VI (1977).

²⁴ G. B. Townend, in *Laurea Corona* (1987) 84-8.

²⁵ E.g. Otis 1963 (B 135A) 129, 228, etc.

and more different ways of analysing language, metre, assonance, structure, symbolism and so on, suggesting that all these things were planted by Virgil and the others in their poetry in the expectation that the more appreciative reader would be equipped to observe them for himself and to gain the more from the work. There is little evidence, however, that this sort of awareness was encouraged by the *grammaticus* or the literary critic, who were more concerned with correct reading and the understanding of references, in the manner of a good nineteenth-century commentary. It is more credible, though unprovable, that the greatest artist may admit these elements unconsciously, and that the reader may equally unconsciously enjoy and value the work all the more on account of these qualities.

V. THE ACCESSIBILITY OF LITERATURE

The impact of major literature on the great public is hard to assess. The considerable production of tragedies seems never to have reached the theatres, the output of Asinius Pollio and Ovid evidently having little more success than Augustus' abortive *Ajax*; the *Medea* is one of Ovid's very few works not to be preserved for posterity (Quint. *Inst.* x.1.98; Tac. *Dial.* 12.6). Seneca's surviving plays contain elements of descriptions of their action suggesting that they did not need to be seen to be appreciated, but rather read aloud, perhaps to the accompaniment of dancing or mime. Mime itself, which under the late Republic retained some of the literary quality of Herondas and Sophron, still found no favour with Horace (*Sat.* 1.10.5-6). Under the Empire it came to depend more and more on the obscene and the spectacular, including real sex and real crucifixions, until it seems to have merged with pantomime. This never ranked as literature, despite the libretti derived from Virgil and Ovid and others specifically written by Lucan and Statius.

The most significant type of public performance becomes the *recitatio*, of poetry and prose alike. This seems to have been the regular way of launching a new work before the publication of an approved text.²⁶ Only after such an occasion, and the correction of faults which might have come to light, would the author make the work available to the public; and this, in the case of Virgil and Persius, and probably Lucan, might mean posthumous publication. Subsequent reading might also take the form of an oral performance, often by specifically trained slaves, to an individual or a group. In addition, we hear of public performances by professional *cantores*, as something quite distinct from Virgil's own reading of the *Georgics* and of three books of the *Aeneid* to the imperial household, as well as trials of various passages before a rather wider

²⁶ Kenney in Kenney and Clausen 1982 (B 95) 12.

audience (Suet. *Vita Ver.* 27, 32-3). Horace in particular (*Sat.* 1.4.73-7) emphasizes that he never recites his works except to selected friends and on their express insistence; while others take advantage of the crowds in the public baths to force their works on all sorts of listeners. The importance of all these readings will have been greatly increased by the extent of aural memory enjoyed by a society with far less written material than the modern world possesses, so that whole passages appear to have been retained by hearers, with varying degrees of accuracy.²⁷

But apart from the fact that reading, like writing, was almost always carried out aloud, the general status of reading appears to have borne a considerable similarity to that of our own day, with bookstalls selling copies for personal enjoyment and most works available in the great public libraries, which begin almost exactly with the Augustan age and expanded rapidly in the following two centuries.²⁸ We still hardly know the extent of these collections, nor how far the different libraries duplicated each other. It would appear that readers would normally consult books inside the libraries, as in the British Library or the Bodleian. It may have been exceptional, and a matter of privilege, for Marcus Aurelius in the second century to report to Fronto that he has taken certain volumes of Cato out of the library of Apollo on the Palatine and advise him to bribe the librarian of the Tiberian collection to let him have copies from there.

Some works were evidently produced in fairly large numbers, with individuals having copies made by their own slaves from a borrowed text; others probably never merited marketing to any effective extent. Survival down to the Renaissance is little indication of the availability of works in antiquity: the fact that Velleius has come down to us largely complete cannot be proof of wide circulation. On the other hand, there is reason to suppose that Juvenal made so little impact in his own day that he survived only because of a surprising popularity in the fourth century, attested by Ammianus (28.4.14), when there was a sudden demand for improved texts, enriched with scholia and commentitious biographies of the author.²⁹ Gellius provides some interesting stories, not always plausible, of discovering rare texts in unlikely places (e.g. IX.4.1, XVIII.9.5); yet Quintilian can recommend for the student's reading a very wide range of authors as undistinguished as Rabirius and Albinovanus Pedo (e.g. X.1.90), who must at least have been available in one or more of the public libraries. It is a bolder assertion that the libraries in Rome also contained copies of all the obscure works cited only by Dionysius of

²⁷ Few can have rivalled the elder Seneca, who wrote down extensive passages from declamations he had listened to. There is no reason to suppose that he made use of shorthand reports, although both Greek and Latin systems existed by that date.

²⁸ Kenney in Kenney and Clausen 1982 (B 95) 24-5.

²⁹ Hight 1954 (B 84A) 186-7.

Halicarnassus or the elder Pliny. It may well be that these libraries were such easy victims of deliberate arson in later times of trouble that their collections would provide relatively few archetypes for transmission, and that the chances were better for books in private houses. Yet from Pompeii and Herculaneum together we have recovered only one library, consisting of Epicurean treatises otherwise lost, and not a single book from any other house. The element of hazard in the survival of books was so great that, apart from the evidence of wide circulation, largely dependent on use in the schools, of a few major writers like Virgil, Horace and Cicero, no safe conclusion can be drawn about the number of copies ever made. The total loss of Varius' poems or the histories of Cremutius Cordus (officially destroyed but preserved for subsequent distribution) and of the elder Pliny may indicate either a lack of quality or an excess of quantity, which made copying impracticable and allowed most of Livy to survive only in epitomes; but Pliny's *Natural History* has nevertheless survived, and so have the Neronian pastoralists.

The evidence for the familiarity of the great writers outside the educated elite is very small, almost limited to the few tags written on the walls of Pompeii, which do not extend far beyond *arma virumque conticuere omnes* (the opening words of the first two books of the *Aeneid*) and a variety of odd lines from different parts of the same poem, evidently employed for writing exercises, from places as remote as Masada and Vindolanda.³⁰ Of specifically popular literature we have hardly any traces. When Horace wishes to contrast his own supposedly good taste with that of his down-to-earth slave (*Sat.* II.7.95-101), he chooses painting, not literature, as the field of aesthetic expertise. But perhaps Davus could not afford books in any case, or could not read, at least well enough to do so with pleasure. His knowledge of Crispinus' philosophy he attributes to the oral teaching of Crispinus' porter. The press, providing the great majority of people with their main or sole reading today, was represented by the *Acta*, certainly not mass-produced and hardly likely to have a general appeal.

Where the modern world suggests fiction as the obvious type of literature to attract a wide public, we hear of little but 'the Milesian tale', suitably bawdy indeed and made available in Latin by Sisenna in the first half of the second century B.C. The Milesian tradition is certainly traceable in episodes of Petronius' *Satiricon*, such as the tale of the Widow of Ephesus, and may have played a considerable part in the origin of the whole of that work, with contributions from the Greek novel, evidently available to, and perhaps popular with, the large Greek-speaking element in the population of Rome and other Italian cities. The *Satiricon*, even in its mutilated state, is much too complex and sophisticated a work

³⁰ A. K. Bowman and J. D. Thomas, in *JRS* 76 (1986) 122, and in *Britannia* (1987) 125-142 with a useful list of such quotations and their provenances.

to have arisen from nothing,³¹ although, as mentioned above, it fits awkwardly into the genre of Menippean satire and is totally ignored by Quintilian, who would have been hard pressed to recommend it for the training of the young orator, even if he had ever come across a copy of it. Although the low language and the low subject-matter might well appeal to a popular readership, a great deal of literary criticism and similar matter seems to be aimed only at a very limited circle; and the same is true of the other Menippean satire to survive, the *Apocolocyntosis*, patently written for circulation among a select group of readers at a particular point in time.

We do possess one writer, from the reign of Tiberius, who stands altogether apart from the fashion and attracted no attention from literary critics, although he may have been considerably more popular and widely read than many more imposing poets. Phaedrus was an imperial freedman, who was at one time involved in trouble with Sejanus. He versified a large number of supposedly Aesopian fables, adding some of his own, including a few on distinctively Roman contemporary topics. He is no master, but writes engagingly and unpretentiously, arousing the question as to how unusual his writing was in an age of great sophistication, and how far he was writing for a distinct level of reader. With his simple language and metre and his improving morals, he appears to be aiming at the younger pupils of the *grammaticus*; and these qualities probably contributed to his survival into the modern world. The fables would certainly have greater appeal to an elementary reader than the Twelve Tables of early law which at one time seem to have served this purpose; but we have no direct evidence of Phaedrus' use in the schools.

What is most striking in the Roman world is the lack of any basic text which was read by any who could read and listened to regularly by all, as the English bible was for at least 300 years, providing a common focus of language and knowledge. To a certain extent Homer had filled this place in some Greek cities at least in the classical period and probably later; although his language was far removed from colloquial Greek even in the fifth century B.C. and his very bulk made him difficult to assimilate. Virgil could make some claims to have become the bible of Rome, almost as soon as the *Aeneid* appeared; but the occasions of hearing him read cannot have been frequent, and an influence on Roman life which might have been a major force on the side of humanity and peace was never allowed to become really widespread. It is hard to imagine that any other writer of the period, even Horace or Seneca, can have had even that slight chance of exercising serious influence on the society to which they belonged.

³¹ P. Parsons, in *BICS* 18 (1971) 53-66, sees some parallel to the *Satiricon* in a Greek papyrus, probably of the second century A.D. (POxy. 3010), suggesting the existence of a picaresque narrative tradition in Greek on which Petronius may have drawn.

CHAPTER 20

ROMAN ART, 43 B.C. TO A.D. 69

MARIO TORELLI

I. THE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF AUGUSTAN CLASSICISM

In the history of ancient art few changes are so dramatically apparent as that which unfolded, gradually yet unmistakably, during the first two decades of the reign of Augustus. This change came about under the banner of a Classicism inspired by the great Attic examples of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. The origins of this Classicism were, however, remote. In the architectural and art-historical context of late republican 'Asiatic luxury' (*luxuria Asiatica*), both the Classical models, which were already present in the Hellenistic culture inspiring that *luxuria*, and the genuinely baroque practices, which were peculiar to middle and late Hellenistic art, had been enthusiastically welcomed by Roman patrons of the ruling class.¹ But in the Augustan and Julio-Claudian age, Classicism became an official artistic programme and one unique to the capital,² and from this centre emanated the models adopted by greater and lesser private patrons, as well as by Italian and provincial municipalities, especially in the West. Both taste and knowledge were so deeply affected that the history of Roman imperial art can to a large extent be seen as a series of variations on and interpretations of the Classicizing message.

In the age of Caesar, official architecture, sculpture and painting were still deeply imbued with a baroque and Hellenistic dramatic force, but they also recalled the distant experiences of the artistic culture common to the Etruscan and Italic world (the *koine*) of the third century B.C. This is especially discernable in the formal duality of the portrait. In portrait sculpture, an art deeply imbued with local ideology, the spare, incisive, 'realistic' aspects of the Italian portrait in fact co-existed with the distinctly psychological features, full of pathos, of the late-Hellenistic portrait. The point can be made quite simply by comparing the basic,

¹ F. Coarelli, *DArch* 2 (1968) 302ff; *id.* *DArch* 4-5 (1970-1) 241ff; *id.* *St. Mittell.* 15 (1970) 85ff; *id.* in Zanker 1976 (E 141) 21ff; *id.* in *L'art décoratif à Rome* (Rome, 1981) 229ff.

² Zanker 1988 (F 633); Simon 1987 (F 577); *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik* 1988 (F 443), the catalogue of an exhibition at Berlin.

linear countenances of the 'Arringatore' (The Orator, c. 100 B.C.)³ and of Caesar (c. 50 B.C.)⁴ on the one hand, with the soft, shaded features of the so-called Postumius Albinus (convincingly identified as Cato the Censor, c. 150 B.C.) and of Pompey (c. 60 B.C.) on the other.⁵ The two formal approaches continued to co-exist in the second half of the first century B.C., but the 'Italic' modes tended increasingly to denote municipality or provincial patronage, and they spread eventually to the lowest social and cultural levels of so-called 'plebeian art'. We shall return to this later.

In the official art of the court and the great aristocracy of Rome, the moment of transition from this ambiguous coexistence of 'Italic' with late Hellenistic forms to the decisive selection of Classicism may be situated in a brief period of political and cultural settlement, that is, in the decade which followed the constitutional change of the year 27 B.C. Shortly before that date, characteristic late republican tendencies are still clearly in play. Portrait sculpture continues to produce masterpieces with a flavour of Hellenistic dynasticism, such as the 'Actium'-type portrait of Octavian⁶ or the 'Gabii'-type of Agrippa.⁷ Decorative painting continues to develop the long established themes of the Second Style, with its characteristic 'open walls' and wide scenic perspectives,⁸ while public and private architecture operate within the framework of models developed between the end of the second and the middle of the first century B.C.⁹ The last decade of the first century was, however, already dominated by the Classicizing language of the Augustan regime.¹⁰ The 'Prima Porta'-type portrait of Augustus embodies the propaganda message of the new convictions of the Principate.¹¹ In painting, plain, undisturbed tapestries, across which run slender candelabras and minute friezes in the Third Style, support reproductions of the great Classical Greek panel paintings;¹² while architecture and architectural ornamentation in marble and stucco echo – in the context of consolidated building types – the Attic, or at least Classical, models of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.¹³ By now imperial Roman Classicism is completely formed and functioning.

As we have seen, the new style was not in fact entirely new: behind it

³ T. Dohrn, *Der Arringatore* (Berlin 1968); M. Cristofani, *Bronzi Etruschi I. La plastica votiva* (Novara, 1985) no. 129.

⁴ F. Johansen, *Ancient Portraits in the J. Paul Getty Museum* 1 (Malibu, 1987) 24ff.

⁵ L. Giuliani, *Bildnis und Botschaft* (Frankfurt am Main, 1986). ⁶ Zanker 1973 (F 627).

⁷ M. Hofter, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) no. 150, pp. 313f.

⁸ The documentation is splendidly collected by Beyen 1938–60 (F 271). The highest urban level is that of the House of Augustus: Carettoni 1983 (F 316); also Barbet 1985 (F 262).

⁹ P. Gros, G. Sauron, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 48ff. F. Coarelli, *ibid* (1988 (F 443)) 68ff.

¹⁰ M. Torelli, *Index* 13 (1985) 589ff.

¹¹ Vierneisel and Zanker 1979 (F 605).

¹² Bastet and de Vos 1979 (F 265).

¹³ *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) *passim*, reviews the decoration of the principal Augustan monuments at Rome.

lay over 150 years of history. A work like the pediment in Via San Gregorio¹⁴ sufficiently conveys with its decidedly classicizing character the antiquity of neoclassical experience in the city, under the stimulus of the strong classicizing element in the late Hellenism of Pergamum and Athens. What was new was the pervasive, all-embracing aspect of Classical forms, which freed buildings and their decoration, official sculptures, and urban planning from all that unrestrained baroque freedom (*licentia*) which came from the effrontery (*audacia*) of the Alexandrians. New also was the nostalgic recovery of a Roman and Italian national past onto which was grafted the formal, Classicizing message; and new too was the general and enthusiastic support of the Roman aristocracy and of the local magnates of Italy, the *domi nobiles*, for the unique programme developed in the capital. Baroque, Hellenistic experiences were thus pushed to the side, to be looked for in the narrow confines of private consumption of art, in silverware and fine pottery, and in the minor genre paintings, landscapes and still lifes, which were placed side by side with copies of classical or great classicizing paintings in the Arcadian gardens of urban villas.

Consistently with the assumptions of the Augustan programme for restoration, all these non-Classicizing forms were assigned to the representation of idylls and escapes, trifles (*nugae*) and erotic themes, that is, modes and fashions outside of reality, pseudo-messages void of content. But the very limiting of private and public *luxuria* imposed by the policy of the *princeps* ended by incorporating such developments, however devalued of meaning they may have been, so that often the Classicizing idiom, which tended to eliminate such risky departures from the austere and ubiquitous realm of official ideology, came to the surface even in the private consumption of art.

The ban on baroque language was accompanied by censure of any element that did not conform to the central plan of moral restoration. Once the military triumphs of the *nobilitas* were done away with (to be reserved for the *princeps* and his family), the great public building activity which had been financed by the generals' spoils of war (*ex manubiis*) came also to an end, along with all the dynastic ideology which it had carried in the last century of the Republic. The grandiloquent decorative programmes, both public and private, which had been aimed at individual glorification – using Hellenistic forms of self-representation – gave way in the public arena to imperial initiative alone, and in private to less compromising 'galleries' populated by the images of philosophers, or

¹⁴ This pediment, like others of the second century B.C. (Rome, in the Via Latina; Luni; Volterra, etc.) needs reconsideration. See meanwhile, M. J. Strazzulla in M. Martelli, M. Cristofani, eds., *I caratteri dell'ellenismo nelle urne etrusche* (Florence, 1977) 41ff.

athletes or of gods, where *otium* (leisure) either had exclusively intellectual connotations or merely expressed a desire for escape.

This profound 'renewal', then, had its programmatic foundations in the ideology of the state. That was carefully fashioned by the great intellectuals within the circle of the *princeps*, from a singular mixture of Classicizing ideals, which were developed from the 'inimitable models' of the Greeks, and of national, Romano-Italian traditions, which were organized within the framework of a revival of Archaizing customs and native memories. The new figurative culture constituted a formidable vehicle for the propagation of the religious, political and symbolic elements of this revival in the most remote municipalities of Italy and among the lowest levels of society.

The instrument for the remarkable diffusion of this programme was above all a favoured group of sculptors in marble and bronze of the neo-Attic school. These men had already become established in Italy during the late Republic, working in Rome or Campania in a number of workshops, and controlled either directly or indirectly by such Roman aristocrats as Junius Damasippus, the Cossutii, or the notorious Gaius Verres. First among these workshops in both organization and quality was that directed by Pasiteles, who was head of a school which was well known for at least three generations.¹⁵ There were, moreover, a large number of lesser, anonymous stone-cutters as well as legions of fresco-painters, also anonymous, to whom the whole of Italy, from the *princeps* to the humblest *municeps*, entrusted the decoration of their houses. Along with the even humbler crafters of small-scale work in metal and terracotta, these sculptors revived and developed Classical and Hellenistic models in the new spirit, operating within a capillary-like network of workshops, each with its own rules of apprenticeship and instruction, and within a no less capillary circulation of moulds, casts and clay models (*proplasmata*). Thanks to new discoveries, we now know far more about these than was revealed to us by the well-known anecdote about the plaster models used by Pasiteles.¹⁶

Thus the vein of formal inspiration began in a transplantation of neo-Attic craftsmen into a Roman environment which dates back to the middle of the second century B.C., with the activity of the school of

¹⁵ On these ateliers, in addition to works cited in n. 1, see G. Becatti, 7 (1940) 7ff; M. Torelli, *MAAR* 36 (1980) 313ff; *id. Scienze dell' Antichità* 2 (1988) 403ff.

¹⁶ Clay *proplasmata* intended to serve as models for moulds for bronze sculptures have been discovered by M. A. Tomei (*Archeologia laziale* 7 (1987) 73f, fig. 6) in the excavation of the *Domus Tiberiana*. These may be set beside the fragments of plaster casts of the Tyrannicides of Critios and Nesiotes discovered at Baiae with the well-known copy of the Sosandra (C. Landwehr, *Die antiken Gipsabgüsse aus Baiae* (1985)), in order to show the very close link between imperial residences and artisan activity in the replication and collage of works of art.

Timarchides, and it must have been re-invigorated under Augustus, thanks to the *pax Augusta* and the gradual extension of imperial monopoly over marble quarries. The very concentration of refined sculptors' studios around the palace, to which discoveries at the *Domus Tiberiana* on the Palatine and at Baiae bear witness, must have encouraged both centralization in the development of models and the creation of schools and workshops far more stable than those which had existed in the past, and thus the formation of an artistic tradition less sporadic and occasional than that of the late Republic. The proof of this is to some extent also offered by the solid fabric of Classicizing style which developed in the age of Augustus and which essentially continued into the reign of Domitian, when there probably occurred a new influx of artists and craftsmen from the eastern Mediterranean, in the wake of the pharaonic building programmes undertaken by that emperor.¹⁷

II. THE CREATION OF THE AUGUSTAN MODEL

The death of Julius Caesar put a sudden end to the grandiose projects of urban transformation cherished by the dictator.¹⁸ It would fall to Octavian Augustus to resume, especially after Actium, the plans of his adoptive father, whose purpose it had been to imprint the Julian name (*nomen Iulium*) on the imperial capital. The first steps of the young *princeps* were informed by the same dynastic conception that had characterized Pompey's works in the Campus Martius and Caesar's own designs.

Typical of this is the choice of model for his own mausoleum, possibly begun in 27 B.C., which recalls that of the tomb of Alexander;¹⁹ while both the public and the private activities of his appointed successor, Agrippa, between the Campus Martius and the right bank of the Tiber, carried out in the years from 33 to 19 B.C., were certainly inspired by great Ptolemaic models. This can especially be seen if we consider the close link between Agrippa's urban villa across the Tiber (*trans Tiberim*) – most likely the so-called Casa della Farnesina – and the *stagnum* (pool) and the *Euripus* (canal) located at the edge of the complex made up by the Pantheon, *saepta* (voting enclosure), baths, *campus Agrippae* and *porticus Vipsaniae*, all completed or planned by him.²⁰ This foreshadows the similar egyptianizing effects which Hadrian would recreate a century and

¹⁷ Workshops were formed in the age of Domitian to respond to the demands of his colossal building programme, a phenomenon still little investigated (and responsible for the improbable Domitianic chronologies sometimes attributed to such works as the great Trajanic frieze). See the preliminary remarks of M. Torelli, in *L'Urbs – Espace urbain et histoire* 1987 (A 96) 376ff.

¹⁸ On these projects and Caesarian town planning in general: Gros and Torelli 1988 (A 41) 117ff and 167ff; H. v. Hesberg, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 93ff.

¹⁹ H. von Hesberg, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 121ff.

²⁰ F. Coarelli, *MEFR* A 89 (1977) 816ff; *id.* in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 71ff; Roddaz 1984 (C 200) 231ff (with useful bibliography).

a half later in his villa at Tivoli, with its evocative coupling of baths and Canopus; but it recalls above all the model of urban organization offered by Alexandria and repeated by the Augustan plan of *regiones* and *vici*. The tradition of the *virī triumphales* of the late Republic was also revived by Augustus with the theatre dedicated to his first heir Marcellus (23 B.C.) and with the restoration of the temple of Apollo in *Circo* attached to that theatre, thanks to which he was able to reinforce the Apollinian propaganda, launched after Actium, with a more traditional reference to the memory of the *nomen Iulium* which was associated with the first dedicant of the temple, Cn. Iulius (consul in 431 B.C.).²¹ The construction of the temple of Palatine Apollo (36–28 B.C.) next to his house bore the same dynastic imprint. Watched over by the Magna Mater (an obvious symbol of the Trojan origins of both his *gens* and of Rome), and by his personal god, the prophet Apollo (who had been a reliable guide during the clash at Actium), the house evokes the model of the palaces of Hellenistic kings, which were likewise protected by the great personal deities of the *basileus*.²² And another reminder of Egypt is offered by the *solarium*, the colossal sundial centred on the *obeliscus Augusti*, which he laid out on the extreme northern boundary of his city, a most unusual *horologium* set as it were in a gigantic garden (10 B.C.).²³

In his other *opera triumphalis*, the Forum of Augustus,²⁴ which he vowed in 42 and inaugurated in 2 B.C., he follows yet again in Caesar's footsteps. On the pediment of the temple of Mars Ultor (Mars the Avenger), at the end of the Forum, Caesar's divine ancestress Venus Genetrix stood side by side with Augustus' Mars Ultor: a sacred marriage which was to be interpreted in a dynastic sense. To this Augustus added statues representing his own ancestors, mythical and historical, on one side of the Forum, and these faced a Romulean procession of the great men, the *summi viri*, of the city's history, on the other side. The *gens* of the new Aeneas and the new Romulus thus recapitulated the historical fortunes of Rome, a theme which was, as we shall see, developed in the Ara Pacis and which well displays the substance of the ideology of the Augustan Principate: the *princeps*, and he alone, had the right to mix or to juxtapose the public with the private. And indeed, in 19 B.C., Cornelius Balbus was the last triumphing general able to erect an edifice from his spoils, the *theatrum* with the *crypta Balbi*; after him there would be no more triumphs, save for those enjoyed by the emperor or his family, and consequently monuments would no longer be erected to celebrate the personal glories of the Roman aristocracy.

²¹ E. La Rocca, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 121ff; A. Viscogliosi, *ibid.* 136ff.

²² G. Carettoni, *ibid.* 263ff. ²³ E. Buchner, *ibid.* 240ff.

²⁴ J. Ganzert, V. Kockel, *ibid.* 149ff.

We may safely assert that, even if some works were completed a little later, in the course of the penultimate decade of the century the most complex and daring initiatives in architecture and urban planning of the Augustan period came to an end. Nevertheless, even where he did not erect new buildings or where the ideological interweaving of past and present was more subtle, Augustus imposed through his programme a new coherence on buildings which already existed, restoring a few – in his *Res Gestae* he claims to have restored eighty temples! – or adding some others, so as to compose a unified ideological design whose aim was the customary glorification of his own role as *princeps*. This is apparent above all in the old Forum Romanum. Here the reconstruction of the main temples and public buildings – the temples of Castor and Pollux, of Saturn, and of Concordia, the basilicas, the Curia, and the *regia* – have the evident objective of imposing the *nomen Iulium* as extensively as possible on the most majestic urban complex of the city, while at the same time ‘re-employing’ all the venerable buildings within the context of his personal propaganda. Thus new messages were skilfully juxtaposed with or superimposed on ancient ones: his wife Livia was paired with Concord (A.D. 6); his grandsons the *principes iuventutis* were joined with Castor and Pollux (A.D. 7). But a quite different and crucial role was played by a few additions to the Forum which were statements of Augustan policy, that is, by the dynastic temple of the Divine Julius – which was set between two triumphal arches of Augustus, the one celebrating his victory at Actium (29 B.C., later tactfully transformed into a Dalmatian arch), the other his Parthian success (19 B.C.) – and by the Portico of Gaius and Lucius (A.D. 2). These monuments very elegantly exclude ‘undesirable’ buildings from the open space, undesirable either because they were associated with other aristocratic families, or because they could not be integrated into the new, Augustan ideological system: for example, the basilica Aemilia on the one hand, the *regia* and the *aedes Vestae*, which were replaced in the conception of the *princeps* by his residence on the Palatine, on the other.²⁵

Although beset with continuous crises over the succession, the years of the consolidation of power were consistently devoted to these exercises in sophisticated urban ‘inlay’, which in fact destroyed or radically transformed earlier meanings as surely as his settlement of the constitution. But these years were also devoted to the reorganization of the administrative structure and functioning of the city, one similar to and as necessary as that enforced by Agrippa in his *cura aquarum*. In addition to their use in the collection of customs and the control of public order, the ancient, fourth-century city walls came again to mark

²⁵ Coarelli 1983 (E 19) II 211ff; with Gros 1976 (F 397).

the boundary between city and country through the systematic restoration of all the city gates (between A.D. 2 and 10), thus reaffirming the powerful symbolic value of both wall and gates which was to find a very special echo in the architecture and town planning of the Augustan cities of Italy and Gaul. In the years 8 and 7 B.C., the banks of the Tiber were set in order, the night watch (the *cohortes vigilum*) was established, and the city and the *continentia tecta* (the inhabited parts of the city and suburb) were divided into fourteen regions: together these completed in the organizational sphere the readjustment which Augustus had already begun between 12 and 7 B.C. in the religious sphere, with the institution of his personal cult in the sites of the *compita*, the shrines of the urban crossroads.²⁶

In his *Res Gestae* Augustus placed great emphasis on his personal benefactions in the development of the city. Despite the customary official phrasing of the document, he goes far beyond the accepted practice of normal *elogia* and *commentarii*, not only in the boundless immensity of his achievements, but especially in the emphasis on the intensely urban character of his efforts, which did remain until the time of Domitian the grandest and most comprehensive in the history of the city: 'a city whose magnificence was not equal to the majesty of her empire, and which was exposed to floods and fires, he so improved that he might rightly boast that he left a city of marble which he had received made of brick' (Suet. *Aug.* 28). It is surprising then that the architectural expression of such a project should be essentially very limited and conventional. The great piazzas enclosed with porticoes and with temples at the end or in the centre, such as the Forum of Augustus and the *porticus Liviae* (A.D. 7), or open with temple at the centre of porticoes on three sides, as in the temple of Apollo Palatinus and perhaps in the Pantheon, are the most common elements of the Augustan contribution to the city. Perhaps its most novel and experimental aspect remains the work of Agrippa in the Campus Martius, with its intentional confusion of public and private, of dwellings, public parks, recreational spaces, boulevards and reflecting pools, a confusion which would reappear explicitly only in Nero's grand creation of 'private' buildings with strong dynastic connotations, from his villa at Subiaco to his Golden House. The Alexandrian model – which would then spread in private life, from the architecture of tombs to the Egyptian imagery of the late Second and Third Styles – is not merely mannerist exoticism, comparable to the chinoiserie of eighteenth-century Europe. It is also a recognition of the deep affinity between the realities of life at Alexandria and at Rome, both social and cultural, and at the same time of their

²⁶ F. Coarelli, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 75ff.

correspondingly deep diversity, which leads to the longing for, and the privatisation of, the models derived from that particular variant of Hellenism.

On the other hand, the programme of restoration required that the convictions of 'western' and 'national' values be defended, consolidated and reasserted within the framework of a pervasive *pietas*. Thus can we account for the systematic use of conventional architectural forms – temples on a podium at the end of a porticoed square – which had been the patrimony of Roman culture for over a century and a half, and which were now stripped of the late Hellenistic effronteries to be found in the great Latin and Campanian buildings between 120 and 50 B.C., and clothed again in neo-Attic forms. From the sculptor Diogenes, who was responsible for the decoration of the first Pantheon, to the extremely skilful stone-cutters, who created the elegant architectural partitions for the many sacred and public buildings ordered by Augustus, it was Athenian craftsmen who were the leaders in the neoclassical 'purification' of architectural decoration.

The dominant models are, as in all art forms, those of high Classicism, with a special and understandable predilection for the prototypes of Periclean Athens. The caryatids of the Attic neoclassicist Diogenes are not preserved for us, although we may suspect a Classicizing sculpture, caryatids of the Cherrchell-Tralles or Venice-Mantua type.²⁷ But very clearly intended to evoke religious and revivalist memories are the copies of the *korai* from the portico of the Erechtheum in Athens, which were introduced into the upper storey of the Forum of Augustus and recopied in its replica at Emerita (Mérida, in Spain): these maidens, who are better understood in their role as *kanephoroi* (basket-carriers), encircled the shrines (*heroa*) of the *summi viri* and of the *nomen Iulium*, just as those at Athens are there to honour the tomb of the first king of Attica. All these architectural forms, from the mouldings of the temple podia to the Classical capitals, are crafted in a refined manner based on sharp and subtle lines, on a few projections from the representational plan which give a 'stiacciato' effect (that is, one of very low, flat surfaces) and on clear, undisturbed surfaces. The need for convictions, implicit in the search for the ideological models of Classicism, both shared and secure, asserts itself even in style, a style straining to evoke formal clarities and absolute definitions.

As to private architecture, innovations had already appeared in the culture of the late Republic, and the Augustan age added little to what had already been developed, other than its own neo-classical taste in decoration. Large mosaic pavements in black and white, walls painted in

²⁷ Documentation in E. Schmidt, *Ant. Plastik* 13 (1973); *id. Geschichte der Karyatide* (Würzburg, 1982).

the Third Style, plain *impluvia*, and symmetric peristyles: these are the main contribution of an age concerned with returning to normal all that was bizarre or baroque in the domestic architecture of the late Republic.²⁸ Much broader was the spectrum of funerary typology, which reflects better than any other aspect of the culture the fundamental stratification of society, the ambitions of social ascent, the unifying force of the principles of the court in artistic culture.²⁹ *Columbaria* (tombs with niches for funerary urns) begin to proliferate to meet the needs of the less affluent social classes, while the late republican model of the *naiskos*, or shrine, was replaced in the preferences of the middle and upper classes of society by the tomb set on a tall, austere, archaizing cylinder: the most celebrated examples of this are the tomb of Caecilia Metella at Rome and that of Munatius Plancus at Gaeta, and that colossal *exemplum*, the mausoleum of Augustus. This taste for the exotic also provides a chance to indulge in such oddities as egyptianizing tombs in the form of pyramids. Above all the link – one derived from the practices of Hellenistic dynasts – between tombs and suburban estates, gardens or villas, grew even stronger than it had been, showing that these pyramids were not oddities, but that they too are to be included within the framework, already noted, of the ‘bourgeoisification’ of the royal cultural models of late Hellenism, a process increasingly evident as one penetrates the maze of private culture.

Naturally all this exists in delicate balance with the classicizing tradition, even in sculpture in the round. The programme of sculptural decoration of the Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum³⁰ may have been due (as appears more likely) to a great intellectual of the Caesarian age such as L. Ateius Praetextatus, working for the patrician Claudii Pulchri, or (as some prefer) it may have been created a little later for the Calpurnii Pisones. Either way, it draws from a vast range of sculptural traditions in order to realize an articulated representation of the ideology and the ethical models of the leaders of society in the years of the civil wars. The classicizing formulae, which reach their peak in the ideal coupling of the Doryphorus/Achilles of Polyclitus with the Amazon/Penthesilea of Phidias, pass from the prototypes of the high fifth century B.C. through the late-classical – Lysippus’ Hermes in Repose comes to mind – to end with the Hellenistic, found in garden sculpture. The choice of the prototype to be copied, developed and re-echoed is directly linked to the

²⁸ There is no standard work on Augustan domestic architecture and the relationship between it and painted, marble and stucco decoration. See in the meantime D’Arms 1970 (p. 30); P. Zanker, *JDAI* 94 (1979) 460ff; Mielsch 1987 (p. 502); Neudecker 1987 (p. 513). Most interesting are the remarks of Leach 1982 (p. 465).

²⁹ Eisner 1986 (p. 357); von Hesberg and Zanker 1987 (p. 418).

³⁰ M. R. Wojcik, *Ann. Fac. Lett. Filos. Perugia* 16/17 (1978/79–1979/80) 359ff; amplified in *La villa dei Papiri ad Ercolano* (Rome, 1986).

type of message which was intended: loftier and richer in ethical or political content, for sculptures copied from the Classical; lighter, more idyllic and epigrammatic, for works drawn from the Hellenistic repertory. Naturally in the public part of the house forms and messages are of a higher, Classicizing tone, while in the private area devoted to leisure the prevailing models are Hellenistic or at least escapist. The boundaries between these two levels are obviously very fluid, especially in houses, a fact which encouraged the mixing of genres and idioms in sculpture as well as in the other figurative arts.

The leading patrons called on the expertise of the neo-Attic masters, whom they bound to themselves as freedmen clients, as the above-mentioned case of the Cossutii shows. Already extensive under the late Republic, production expanded even further in order to furnish the town houses, country villas and suburban estates of the Roman aristocracy and the *domi nobiles* of Italy with candelabras, tables, seats, and neoclassical and archaizing reliefs.³¹ These too express in concrete form the same atmosphere of idyll and escape which pervades architecture and painting. But to the same craftsmen and the same workshops are owed the last creations of Hellenistic culture on Italian soil, such as the Athlete of Stephanos, one of the masters of the school of Pasiteles, and above all the copies – either in bronze, with the technique of moulds and of clay models, or in marble, with the technique based on the pointing process – of great Classical originals: these are the key to the decoration of public and private buildings, with all the weight of traditional meanings or of meanings symbolically revived within the Roman context.³²

Because of their talent for copying, these craftsmen had to contend with a series of operations of 'assembly' and 'disassembly' of their own creations. Particularly significant is the operation undergone by the 'Cavaspina', an epigrammatic sculpture which was certainly well known and is late Hellenistic in conception, as can be seen in the copy in London: all the same, in the bronze copy at Rome its head echoes the severe style.³³ The technical ability to reproduce sculpture relatively easily, when joined with a widespread 'culture of artistic canons' (modelled on that of literary canons), forged the opportunity for a whole series of formal tropes: archaistic heads on Classicizing torsees, or Hellenistic draperies on naked limbs in a Classical manner, are to be read

³¹ See the partial collections of K. Fuchs, *Die Vorbilder der neuattischen Reliefs* (Tübingen, 1953) and H. V. Cain, *Römische Marmorkandelaber* (Mainz, 1985). Still worth consulting are the pages of E. Pernice, *Die Hellenistische Kunst in Pompeji* IV–VI (Berlin, 1925–38), with J. Marcadé, *Au Musée de Délos. Étude sur la sculpture hellénistique en ronde-bosse découverte dans l'île* (Paris, 1969). On sculpture in general: N. Himmelmann, *Über Hirten – Genre in der antiken Kunst* (Opladen, 1980), and H. P. Laubscher, *Fischer und Landleute* (Mainz, 1982).

³² Zanker 1974 (F 628); Bieber 1977 (F 283); Martin 1987 (F 495); *id.* in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 251ff, 343ff. ³³ Zanker 1974 (F 628) 81ff.

as stylistic metaphors and transpositions meant to express *variationes*, rhetorical *elegantiae* which do not impair the content. In reality, as it is easy to see in Cicero's superficial remarks in commissioning the decoration for his Tusculan villa,³⁴ this new attitude prefigured that complete devaluation of the messages of the originals which would become typical from the later Julio-Claudian period. In that era copies of great Classical originals, such as the Mantua-type of Phidias' Apollo, are turned into banal lampstands in the townhouses of the Pompeian bourgeoisie, or reversed copies can be discovered facing each other to frame a doorway, as was the fate of the Pothos attributed to Scopas. From earlier symbolic 'translations' of their original content, the better to adapt it to the needs of the high Roman aristocracy, it is an imperceptible slide into pastiche and kitsch, a transformation which is also to be blamed on the gradual loss of coherence of formal values. The growing indifference to organic unity and stylistic coherence prefigures the indifference to content which would represent (with the exception of the great imperial complexes) the doctrine dominating decorations in the high empire.

However, the neo-Attic workshops had an even greater task than that of copying for public and private furnishings: this was to work out a sculpture in the round and in relief to exalt the *virtus* and the *pietas* of the *princeps*, to embody in another language the dynastic ambitions of Augustus and the climate of restoration of national values connected with them. Hence the aforementioned (and completely Hellenistic) concentration around the palace of intense activity in copying and development of the severe, Classical and late-Classical styles with models of terracotta or plaster, which were found at the *Domus Tiberiana* in Rome and the imperial complex at Baiae.³⁵ The Augustan programme called for the suppression of the highly visible phenomenon of self-glorification by aristocratic generals in favour of the restoration of *mos*, custom, and of the different degrees of dignity to which the typology of the statues was correlated. Thus, at the beginning of the Augustan age, Agrippa could still celebrate his own naval victories with an heroic statue inspired by images of Poseidon;³⁶ and this could be echoed, among the *domi nobiles*, by the heroic statue of the Ostian duumvir Cartilius Poplicola, commemorating *his* naval achievements, which were also extolled on the frieze of his sepulchre.³⁷ But the subsequent reduction of military and governing functions by the senatorial aristocracy favoured a rapid return to *mos*. Each function entailed a distinct type of portrait statue: *statuae augurales* and *pontificales* (*capite velato*, with *lituus*

³⁴ Cic. *Fam.* vii.23; *Att.* i.4.3; 5.7; 6.2; 7; 8.2; 9.2; 10.3; 11.3.

³⁵ Cf. n. 16 above.

³⁶ G. Traversari, *Museo Archeologico di Venezia* t. *I ritratti* (Rome, 1986) 29, no. 13.

³⁷ Zevi 1976 (E 142) 56ff, fig. 13.

and sacrificial *patera*) to commemorate priests; *triumphales* (with *lorica*, *toga picta*, *hasta*) for recipients of triumphal honours; *loricatae* (with *lorica*) for military officers; *consulares* (with *toga* and *rotuli*) for consuls; *equestres* (with *tunica* and *paludamentum*) and *sella curuli sedentes*³⁸ for those governing with *imperium* military and civilian provinces, respectively.³⁹ Peripheral regions conformed relatively quickly to the urban model: the honours granted by the Cretans and the Herculaneans to Nonius Balbus⁴⁰ still reflect late-republican practices in the number and even the forms of the statues dedicated to him, but we soon meet the cuirassed statue of M. Holconius Rufus which celebrates, according to its appearance, his military tribunate *a populo*,⁴¹ while such precious documents as the Barberini *togatus* illustrate both senatorial reassertion of the *ius imaginum* (the right to display the death-masks of ancestors who had held public office) and the power of the model of traditional political representation imposed by Augustus.⁴²

Neither the *princeps* himself nor his family failed to observe these norms. Famous statues, such as that from the Via Labicana, depicting Augustus as *pontifex maximus*, or that recently discovered in the Euboean Sea,⁴³ reflecting his *imperium proconsulare maius* and his *ius gladii*, fit perfectly into the typology respectively of *statuae pontificales* and *statuae equestres*. But the profound sense of Augustan mystification is best felt in the most famous statue of the *princeps*, the Augustus of Prima Porta.⁴⁴ Probably intended as a *statua triumphalis* in connexion with the *honores* of the Parthian Arch, it celebrates through the figures on the cuirass deeds worthy of a triumph (*res triumphae dignae*), the return of the Parthian standards, an event which Augustus, with his accustomed skill, did not wish to be celebrated with a triumph. At the same time the statue presents a *princeps* uncharacteristically barefoot, in a heroic pose which is emphasized by the 'quotation' of Polyclitan *ponderatio*. Here as elsewhere, the transgression of *mos*, is confirmed by apparent reaffirmations of that very *mos* combined with marginal departures drawn from the tradition of Hellenistic monarchy. The creation of Augustus' official

³⁸ That is: augural and pontifical statues, head covered and with curved staff and sacrificial bowl; triumphal statues, with cuirass, embroidered toga, and spear; cuirassed statues; consular statues, with toga and scrolls; equestrian statues, with tunic and military cloak; and statues of magistrates sitting in chairs of office. For these concepts: M. Torelli, in A. M. Vaccaro and A. M. Sommella (eds.), *Marco Aurelio. Storia di un monumento e del suo restauro* (Milan, 1989) 83–102.

³⁹ As is shown beyond doubt in the series of statues granted to L. Volusius Saturninus (cos. 3 B.C.) in connexion with the *honores* he had received. See most recently S. Panciera, in *I Volusii Saturnini – Una famiglia romana della prima età imperiale* (Bari, 1982) 83ff.

⁴⁰ See most recently S. Adamo Muscettola, *Prospettiva* 28 (1982) 2ff; for the inscriptions, L. Schumacher, *Chiron* 6 (1976) 163ff. ⁴¹ Zanker 1988 (F 633) 331, fig. 259.

⁴² M. Torelli, *Index* 13 (1983) 389ff, with P. Zanker, *Wiss. Zeitschr. der Humboldt Univ. Berlin* 31 (1982) 307ff; *id.* 1983 (F 631) 251ff.

⁴³ M. Hofter, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) no. 168, p. 323f; and E. Touloupa, *ibid.* no. 149, 311ff. ⁴⁴ See above, n. 7.

portrait and the parallel evolution of private portraiture in the second half of the first century B.C. take us over the same route. Portraits of the La Alcudia-type and the Actium-type, such as that of Agrippa, still follow the tradition of dynastic portraiture which flourished in the inflamed atmosphere of the Second Triumvirate. Echoes of this style are also to be found in private portraiture, even of women, as is shown by the extraordinary gallery of busts from the tomb of the Licinii.

The creation of the Prima Porta-type, which is dated by coins to the period when Octavian proclaimed himself Augustus (27 B.C.), but which ought perhaps to be associated with his triple triumph of 29, is the first consciously and decisively neoclassical step in portrait sculpture. Its success is witnessed by the number of copies, by its use over the whole span of Augustus' reign and beyond, and by its close connexion with the Augustan programme, stripped as it was of any glamorous dramatization of dynastic power, and lit from within by the aura of the *numen*, the divine nature. When we can glimpse in the better copies, such as that from the Via Labicana, the high level of the original, we can perfectly understand the sense of the message which permeates the extremely delicate workings of the surface, the accurate, almost academic, depiction of the hair, and the balance between a well-observed bone structure and a lightly shaded skin, that is to say, the successful distancing of the image from worldly concerns. In a word, on the formal level, the antithesis between the 'realistic' Roman portrait and its 'psychological' Hellenistic rival is resolved, through appeal to neoclassical modes of expression. The Classicizing assurance here becomes assurance of the rebirth of a charisma which is ancient, aristocratic, national, and therefore neither heroic nor Hellenizing, the aura of one who is 'leader', *princeps*, of a universal following, *clientela*, and confirmed as such by his divine origins: *numen adest*, a god is present.

Neo-Attic workmen were also engaged in the creation of the most important monument of Augustan sculpture, the Altar of Peace, Ara Pacis, which has come down to us in an exceptional state of preservation.⁴⁵ Voted (*constituta*) by the Senate on 4 July 13 B.C., the date of the *princeps'* return from Gaul and Spain, and consecrated (*dedicata*) on 30 January 9 B.C., the wedding anniversary of Augustus and Livia, the monument restated, but in a form much more grandiose and with the much more pronounced *maiestas*, majesty, of the *lex arae* (the sacred law concerning sacrifice at the altar), the motifs which had appeared in an altar dedicated to Fortuna Redux in 19, near the temples of Honos and Virtus outside the Porta Capena, to celebrate the return of Augustus from the East. Both altars wished to exalt in public forms a custom which was traditionally private and informal, the *ire obviam* (in Latin) or the

⁴⁵ Torelli 1982 (F 596) 27ff; S. Settis, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 400ff.

apantesis (in Greek), that is the going to meet a person of high rank outside the traditional boundaries of the city – here represented at the southernmost extremity by the Altar of Fortune Who Brings Back, and at the northernmost by the Altar of Peace. In fact both monuments were intended as substitutes for a triumph which Augustus no longer wanted (Flor. II.34). However – and this is a typically Augustan trait – the renunciation of the triumph and of the excessive honours voted by the Senate was here rewarded with the establishment among the forms of state ceremony of a private custom with a dynastic flavour. The celebration of the return (*reditus*) became in this way an integral part of the prerogatives of the *princeps*, through a process in which the Ara Pacis is the basic point of both arrival and departure.

The placing of the monument, beside the Via Flaminia but open to the Campus Martius, is significant. In this case the northern boundaries of the city are imaginary (as is the ‘realistic’ depiction of the *reditus* on the reliefs), but setting the altar a Roman mile from the *pomerium* is a concrete representation of *mos*, insofar as it separates *imperium militiae* from *imperium domi*, the *imperia* of war and peace. According to juridical tradition, in passing this imaginary line the magistrate was obliged to take on the clothes and demeanour of *imperium domi*. Placing the altar at this point (where at that time the new pomerial line was drawn) is a clear announcement of peace, and at the same time it is the result of that choice and it alone (not of some obscure cabalistic leanings), fully conforming to the Augustan habit of formally reviving traditional values, even though they may be introducing *nova exempla*.

Evocation of the past extends also to the shape of the monument, which is a traditional U-shaped altar set at the centre of a small enclosure. With its imitation of pillar posts at the four corners and of wooden panelling within, this enclosure is intended to reproduce a *templum in terris*, a space set aside for *auspicia* and *auguria*. At the same time, with the two doors (which are contrary to the norm for augural *templa*) and with the metallic appearance of the vegetal decoration on the exterior, it also recalls the shrine of Janus Quirinus in the Forum. Both suggestions serve to evoke the aura of augural charisma created by the *princeps* around his own person and the message of peace implicit in his return. The choice of the double model – augural temple and Janus Quirinus – is also reflected in the themes of the decorations in relief which embellish the exterior of the enclosure. The lower part of these reliefs presents swags of acanthus leaves populated with Apollinian swans, imitating metalwork and thus the bronze structure of the Janus Quirinus.

The upper parts of these exterior reliefs present friezes with human figures. On the long sides facing north and south these depict a procession. This cannot be a procession of 13 B.C., since that never took

place, nor one of 9, which if it did occur would not have seen among its participants Agrippa, who is shown on the frieze but who had died in 12. It is rather a theoretical, idealized depiction of an imperial *reditus* for which it clearly aims to establish a norm. It means to depict the *reditus* of 13 B.C. not as it was but as it should have been, so that in future the return of the *princeps* might be marked by that same *ire obviam*, with the same participants and in the same order. An order of procession very carefully worked out by protocol embraces both sides: priests from the *ordo sacerdotum* in front (*pontifices* and *augures* on the south side, *XVviri* and *VIIviri*, on the north) are followed by members of the *domus Iulia* ranged according to the *ordo affinitatis*, their ranking by relationship to him, which was prescribed by *mos* and by Augustus' testamentary wishes. He himself is presented, significantly, in the robes of one sacrificing for his own return, a focal point between priests and relatives. The observation of details of protocol is extremely careful, as is shown, for example, by the presence of the *flamines* out of order at the shoulders of an Augustus presented in his role as *pontifex maximus* (another chronological 'imprecision'), or by the distribution of the two branches of the family on two sides, following firm genealogical logic. As usual, details appear on the frieze which have no relevance to protocol, but which allude rather to matters of status or propaganda, such as the elder Drusus shown in military costume, or the two children Gaius and Lucius Caesar dressed in the manner of participants in the *lusus Troiae*. The panels beside the doors depict the goddess Roma between Honos and Virtus, and Venus-Tellus-Pax among heavenly breezes (*aurae caelestes*), on the east side; those on the west, Mars and the *lupercal*, and Aeneas sacrificing the Laurentine sow, with a complex interweaving of meaning and structural responses between themes and iconographies.

Iconographical echoes among panels on the same side serve to confirm common meanings within the diversity of subjects. Aeneas and Mars, founders respectively of the *gens Iulia* and the *populus Romanus*, are paired – as would happen in the Forum of Augustus – by the omen of the discovery of a mythical animal (the sow and the she-wolf). This prodigy augurs the beginning of different heroic ages and different families, but these are united by the fact that Aeneas was the son of Venus while Mars was her husband, and she in her turn appears on the other side of the monument in the position of the *templum* which, according to augural law, is *sinistima*, or the most favourable of all, and rightly so. On this side the iconographical resemblances serve to establish the indivisibility of the pairing Roma-Venus (a couple later consecrated by Hadrian in his colossal temple) and Roma-Pax, a *pax Romana* in which Rome, flanked by Honos and Virtus, provides the ethical and political key to the monument, where Venus-Pax among the *aurae caelestes* provides the

religious key. Here there is also a series of possible combinations, running from the formulaic 'pax terra marique parata' to the less ritual but more inclusive 'Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divomque voluptas' of Lucretian memory. These two goddesses, representing divine time (*aetas*) and successful conclusions (*res prospere gestas*), and Mars and Aeneas, embodiments of heroic ages (*aetates*) and of beginnings (*initia*) on the west side, correspond precisely with each other, symmetrical both directly and chiasmatically. With a perfect circularity of thought and expression, Rome and Mars represent the dimension of the *urbs*, Venus and Aeneas the dimension of the *gens*: the origins and fulfilment of both are evoked moving from west to east, their revivalist character in the opposite direction. Augustus proceeds from the Via Flaminia across the space of the templum, with the passage rich with omens (*augurium augustum*) over the central augural line, and peacefully celebrates the triumph offered and refused, moving between the two goddesses to leave the temple as the new Aeneas and the new Romulus (proceeding east to west). In the anniversary sacrifices of 30 January and 4 July, entering from the west and leaving from the east side, the *princeps* or the priests on his behalf experience anew the 'historic' sequence of the *primordia urbis* and the *primordia gentis* (the beginnings of the city of Rome and the Julian family), to bear witness to the fact that, thanks to the new Aeneas and the new Romulus, city and family are turning again to the perfection of a new age, *nova aetas*, a *novus ordo saeculorum*.

The style is rich in meanings, all of them playing within the purely traditional framework of augural law, of priestly ritual, of the *ius imaginum* – besides Augustus, only Agrippa and Appuleius Saturninus, as adult relatives and holders of curule magistracies, have a recognizable likeness on the southern frieze of the altar – and of the will of the *paterfamilias*. The style tries to underline the quality and unity of these diverse messages with the variety of languages and the generally Classicizing patina. The tiny frieze crowning the altar, which depicts the procession of the annual *sacrum* composed of the colleges of priests and Vestals with their appropriate victims, has however a didactic tone that has very little classicizing about it, being rather a faithful transcription of the *lex arae* and thus bound to traditional forms of thought and expression. Composed of single figures in fairly high relief, this style reappears in the small friezes on triumphal arches, such as those of Titus in Rome and of Trajan at Beneventum, and it is the most susceptible to 'plebeian involutions'. of which the style of the small frieze on the arch of Constantine is but the culmination. This level of discourse necessarily simplifies and rejects all tendencies of Hellenistic embellishment, but it co-exists with the loftier level of Classicizing abstraction in the great frieze of the procession, where the elimination of any reference to space

and time (a function of the non-realistic character of the representation) corresponds to the fully neoclassical rendering of the faces and postures of the participants in the procession and the rite. A comparison is often made with the frieze on the Parthenon but this refers in a highly idealizing way to the subject-matter of the Ara Pacis: the style of the monument depends rather on late Hellenistic experiments of a classicizing nature, beginning with the great frieze on the altar at Pergamum. This distinction helps us to understand the more decidedly Hellenistic character of the minor panels, born of the same tradition (we can compare them with the Telephos frieze on the Pergamene altar), in which it is much easier to observe the composite nature of the representation, consisting of classicizing figures set against an idyllic Hellenistic landscape. The slight but perceptible difference of style between panels and processional frieze is closely tied to the diversity of genres in the two parts: in the frieze courtly, solemn, timeless and rhetorical in the grand style, but in the panels, seemingly contradictory but callimachean in flavour, that is, Classicizing and pathetic at the same time, as well as homerizing and grandiose in the style of the Hellenistic epyllion. In any case, these diverse stylistic realities, all of them part of the same monument and the same workshop, are perfectly understandable in terms of a neo-Attic culture – one whose strong propensity for elaborate toreutic models is so evident in the frieze of acanthus – a culture acclimatized for some time in Rome and now able to express in accomplished form the regime culture which was now fully functioning in the last decade of the first century B.C.

Painting, however, is even more revealing of the profound changes that occurred in the middle years of the Augustan Principate. The origins of the extremely baroque Second Style can be fixed chronologically at the turn of the second to the first century B.C., and ideologically in the yearning for the impressive spaces and the luxury of decor of late Hellenistic royal palaces. The years of Caesar's brief and brilliant career saw the highest level of *luxuria* expressed by the extraordinary painted architectures, conceived and executed by expert scene-painters on the walls of patrician town residences or of aristocratic villas in Latium and Campania. The decorations of the Roman house on the Esquiline (70 B.C.),⁴⁶ and in the villas of the Mysteries (60 B.C.),⁴⁷ at Boscoreale (60–50 B.C.),⁴⁸ and at Oplontis (50 B.C.),⁴⁹ count among the most significant examples of the high level of quality of this painting, which must be

⁴⁶ P. H. von Blanckenhagen, *MDAI(R)* 70 (1963) 106ff; Gallina 1964 (F 380).

⁴⁷ *Editio princeps* by A. Maiuri, *La Villa dei Misteri* (2nd edn, Rome, 1947).

⁴⁸ B. Andreae, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 273ff.

⁴⁹ A. De Franciscis, *PP* 1973, 433ff; *id.* in *La regione sotterrata del Vesuvio* (Naples, 1982) 907ff. (with earlier bibliography).

assigned to the period between 70 and 50 B.C., linked as it is to the baroque in all the other figurative arts between Sulla and Caesar.⁵⁰ Decorative painting under the Second Triumvirate and in the early years of the reign of Augustus shows the obvious signs of a crisis in this baroque. Augustus' house on the Palatine,⁵¹ decorated after he acquired the property from the orator Hortensius in 36, is a precious document of that crisis and, more generally, of figurative art in the decade before Octavian assumed the title of Augustus. One of the two libraries of the *domus* is marked by a very traditional wall in an austere Second Style: without 'open walls', without effects or perspective, and without copies of famous classical paintings, it essentially offers only a false marble incrustation rendered illusionistically in paint. Other areas, such as the ramp connecting the *domus* with the temple of Palatine Apollo, the great tetrastyle hall (*oecus*), or the Room of the Garlands, show that 'open walls' are confined to the upper parts of the walls. This lesser austerity in decoration, compared to that of the library, indicates the less 'official' character of these rooms. But the 'open wall' with a perspective view and the loss of structural consistency in the decoration of one of the two small rooms (no. 11) to the sides of the reception hall (no. 10), and likewise the insertion of the central painting in bedroom no. 14, reveal the even more private character of these areas. This is most noticeable in the small and extremely private annexe (*diaeta*, no. 7) at the end of the north-west portico of the peristyle, where we find the greatest novelty of the time, a room entirely decorated with a monochrome black background, festoons hanging from small, non-architectural pillars and from very slender candelabras, and idyllic sacred landscapes painted in yellow colour, superimposed: technically we have already reached the Third Style, as in the Black Room in the House of the Farnesina a decade later. It is thus easy to understand why Vitruvius, writing in this very period before 27, penned his invective (VII.5.3) against just such effronteries, which threatened the physical consistency of painted buildings and with it the informing principle of Classical representation, *mimesis*, the imitation of reality.

The trend lamented by Vitruvius made giant strides in a relatively brief time. The House of the Farnesina (which was probably Agrippa's urban villa)⁵² at this point features slender architectural forms and paintings imagined as centrally suspended on walls which are still Second Style, in contrast with the Black Room in full Third Style; whereas the so-called House of Livia, an extension of Augustus' House

⁵⁰ On the relationship between painting and royal architecture: Engemann 1967 (F 359); and K. Fittschen, in Zanker 1976 (E 141) 539ff.

⁵¹ Carettoni 1983 (F 316); Carettoni, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) no. 135, 287ff.

⁵² Bragantini and de Vos 1982 (F 297).

on the Palatine, with its less realistic architecture, large paintings, monochrome friezes and candelabras, belongs about halfway between the House of Augustus and the Farnesina, that is to say, in 30–25 B.C.⁵³ In this particular period, marked by the conquest of Egypt and the Actian triumph, we find the triumphal entry into painting of egyptomania, which informs both the dying Second and the nascent Third Styles. Besides the well-known contemporary Isiac Hall belonging to a private house on the Palatine, the very recent restoration of the decoration of bedroom no. 15, the so-called 'studiolo', on the upper, private floor of the House of Augustus, a room decorated a little later than the one on the lower floor (c. 30–25), shows how rapidly the passion for these particular chinoiserie of Egyptian forms and decorations spread, mostly in the non-public parts of houses, and how a taste for both the floral and the filiform expanded, on which the transition to the Third Style was really based.

As we have already seen, the Third Style in theory took shape around the year 30 B.C. The reasons for its appearance and the paths it followed were completely independent of the conquest of Egypt and the consequent Alexandrianism, although these are often wrongly invoked to explain the beginnings of the Third Style.⁵⁴ However, the resistance shown in the passage cited from Vitruvius must have lasted at least fifteen years, for it is only around the year 15 B.C. that we find the first examples of the Third Style on a large scale, as in the pyramid of Gaius Cestius, built before 12 B.C., and the Auditorium of Maecenas, which certainly predated his death in 8 B.C.⁵⁵ In spite of its non-mimetic and therefore unrealistic and fundamentally anti-classical nature, the new style paradoxically responded perfectly to the expressive demands of Augustan neoclassicism; as such it is no accident that it was revived as the official decorative style for the First Napoleonic Empire. This style also helped to achieve a beneficial sumptuary effect, through the complete suppression of *luxuria*. Valuable objects such as vases of glass and precious metal, gold and silver shields, costly veils and fabrics, painted as if they had been forgotten among the flamboyant building fantasies of the Second Style, appear less and less frequently in the years between 30 and 20 B.C. They give way to values which are no longer sumptuary but ethical, and which are represented by imitations of famous panel paintings placed in a central position, copies or reworkings of classical originals, while the wealth which used to be set realistically

⁵³ *Editio princeps*: Rizzo 1937 (p. 547).

⁵⁴ For problems of chronology, see most recently W. Ehrhardt, *Stilgeschichtliche Untersuchungen an römischen Wandmalereien* (Mainz 1987).

⁵⁵ Pyramid of C. Cestius: P. S. Bartoli, *Gli antichi sepolcri ovvero mausolei romani ed etruschi* (Rome, 1967); Ehrhardt, *Stilgeschichtliche* 33f, figs. 101–4. Auditorium of Maecenas: *ibid* 123f (with earlier bibliography).

among buildings is transformed into costly little objects painted within boards (*pinakes*) and therefore expressly 'false'. All these 'true' values were enhanced by the virtual disappearance of the architectural frames, which were too reminiscent of the *populi voluptas*, the popular pleasure of the theatre, and which were replaced by monochrome surfaces with narrow borders of minuscule friezes, essentially refined tapestries, in order to emphasize subjects or treatments which were either classicizing or purely escapist, bucolic idylls. The effect was remarkable, as witness the frescoes of the villa at Boscoreale (which is rightly thought to have belonged to Agrippa Postumus).⁵⁶

The ancient relationship between a decorative style and the *dignitas* and *decorum* of its surroundings, the explicit link between the public and private function of the parts of the house and their furnishings and decor, which was so alive at the beginning of the Augustan age, began to deteriorate. This was due most probably to the clear 'death of politics', which rendered such links and distinctions obsolete, as well as to the consequent spread of a culture of escapism, one which was largely based on the pervasive diffusion of sacred and idyllic themes. Having passed from gardens and peristyles to reception halls and traditional rooms, these themes were thus translated into stucco for ceilings (the famous stuccoes of the House of the Farnesina come to mind), into large-scale paintings, into *pinakes* or friezes, into relief sculpture in the small neo-Attic panels to be inserted into the walls, and into genre groups or individual sculptures in the round, representing fishermen and priestesses, *erotes* and wild beasts, Apollos demoted to lampstands and Dionysiac figures. The intention was obviously to make sculptures and large paintings stand out against a background of monochrome walls and above mosaic floors which were basically a uniform black and white and devoid of ornamentation, but the devaluation of meaning in all of these scenes is only too evident, if not in purpose then in result.

Official culture having been monopolized by the *princeps*, the urban *nobilitas* or the *domi nobiles* who imitated urban models, the private sphere accounts for the great bulk of consumption of art. Hence there was a diffusion of motifs and themes, which originated at court, within the framework of a production for a more or less wide consumption, one favoured in this case by techniques of 'mechanical' reproduction. The highest quality could be found in relief work in metal and in the art of gem-cutting, where the intrinsic value of the material could not help but accentuate the high level of workmanship. There can be no doubt that for such works the contribution of Hellenistic craftsmen was not only great but decisive, as is the case for example in the cameos – perhaps the most Augustan of the minor arts – designed for the imperial house by

⁵⁶ Von Blanckenhagen and Alexander 1962 (F 287).

such Alexandrian artists as Dioscurides and his son Hyllos.⁵⁷ Extremely sophisticated silverware, from the exceptionally beautiful pieces from Hildesheim to the Hoby cups signed with the significant name of Cheirisophos ('Skilled-of-hand'), bear the imprint of great Hellenistic relief-work.⁵⁸ In the cups from Boscoreale it also grappled successfully with themes of official 'historical' representations,⁵⁹ and contributed no less than cameos and gems to establishing the official standards of good taste. From this there derived objects with a much larger circulation using less valuable materials. Glass and glass paste adopted forms and themes originally found in cameos, in gems, and in plate of precious stone and rock crystal, in order to create either such exceptional pieces as the famous Portland Vase⁶⁰ or vessels for daily use in transparent and coloured glass.⁶¹ Toreutic works had even wider repercussions. On the one hand they inspired decoration, both vegetal and non-vegetal, for ceremonial bronzes (tripods, braziers, table vessels),⁶² while on the other their style came to be engraved on the humblest terracotta, on the 'Campana' plaques used to decorate public and private porticoes and sometimes even temples (which abound in themes beloved of Augustan neoclassicism), and above all on the well-known and very widespread *terra sigillata*, which had been manufactured in the workshops at Arezzo since the age of Caesar, and then in their branch kilns in Italy, and later still in Gaul.⁶³

These luxury goods are understandably linked very closely with the higher expressions of the figurative arts, specifically with bronze and marble sculpture in the round, and thanks to them a single cultural fabric developed which cut across virtually all the social classes capable of expressing artistic culture. From the aristocracy to the middle classes of the Italian towns, they could display their understanding of, and their ability to adapt to, both the formal and the ethical models prescribed by the *princeps*, through portrait sculpture and painting in their houses, through altars placed at crossroads and sculptures among their household furnishings, and through the use of bronzework, silverware and

⁵⁷ On gem-cutting, see the excellent synthesis by C. Maderna-Lauter, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (P 443) 441ff (with earlier bibliography). On the imperial cameos, see especially H. Jucker, *JDAI* 91 (1976) 211ff. ⁵⁸ E. Künzl, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (P 443) 568ff.

⁵⁹ F. Baratte, *Le trésor d'orfèvrerie romaine de Boscoreale* (Paris, 1986).

⁶⁰ E. Simon, *Die Portlandvase* (Mainz, 1957); cf. Simon 1987 (P 577) 162ff.

⁶¹ On this there is no modern, up-to-date synthesis. See the collection of C. Isings, *Roman Glass from Dated Finds* (Groningen, 1957).

⁶² There is no standard work. See meanwhile E. Pernice, *JÖAI* 11 (1908) 212ff; M. Bieber, *Die antiken Skulpturen und Bronzen des königlichen Museum Fredericianum in Kassel* (Marburg, 1915); R. Thouvenot, *Catalogue des figurines et objets de bronze du Musée Archéologique de Madrid* 1 (Paris, 1927); C. Boube Picot, *Les bronzes antiques de Maroc* (Rabat, 1975); J. Petit, *Bronzes antiques de la collection Dutuit* (Paris, 1980).

⁶³ On all these kinds of materials, see A. Giardina, A. Schiavone (eds.), *Merci, mercati e scambi nel Mediterraneo (Società romana e produzione schiavistica* 11, Bari, 1981).

pottery. The *tota Italia* of Augustus was expressed in calculated fashion through an unquestioned, capillary-like acceptance of the artistic culture promoted by the *princeps* for his own city, and spread by those who belonged to this historical bloc in the towns and colonies of the empire.

III. FROM TIBERIUS TO NERO: THE CRISIS OF THE MODEL

Basically the reign of Tiberius was a pedestrian repetition of the pattern laid down by the Principate of Augustus. Tiberius' amply documented lack of enthusiasm for public works lies at the root of the extremely modest innovations of the period in town planning and architecture. The only important work in relief in the city of Rome was the temple of the Divine Augustus, called the *templum novum divi Augusti*, situated between the Palatine and the Capitol in the area of the *vicus Jugarius*, and this is balanced by the 'private' works dedicated by Livia to the memory of her deceased spouse and now deified father by adoption, the Palatine temple of the Divus Augustus and the colossal statue of him near the Theatre of Marcellus.⁶⁴ These initiatives were of great importance, however, because it was undoubtedly in the early years of Tiberius, especially between A.D. 14 and 23, that the cult of the dynasty was spreading through Italy and the provinces along the path of the usual model of *imitatio Romae*. The effects of this diffusion are very striking, and they influenced both town planning and architecture, through the proliferation of temples of Augustus or of Rome and Augustus in Italy and the provinces, and of sculpture and decoration as well, with the endless commissions of statuary groups⁶⁵ depicting what was already in an inscription of A.D. 33 called the *domus divina*, the divine house.⁶⁶

In fact a significant number of the portraits of the first imperial dynasty of Rome are Tiberian in date, and it is in the age of Tiberius that we even find new portrait-types of *Divus Augustus* (probably the so-called Forbes-type, which arguably comes from his colossal statue at the Theatre of Marcellus), as well as of Livia and of Tiberius himself.⁶⁷ On the whole, however, art in the Tiberian age followed in the path traced by Augustus, but it accentuates the traits of formal stiffness and the progressive loss of organic unity and ideological coherence of the Augustan model. Portrait-sculpture – as in the images of Germanicus and Drusus Minor – is increasingly hard and dry; wall-painting unimaginatively echoes the schemes of the Third Style; the decoration of

⁶⁴ On these works of Tiberius and Livia: Torelli 1982 (F 596) 63ff.

⁶⁵ Full bibliography in Hänlein-Schäfer 1985 (F 408); also, *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire romain* (Geneva, 1973); and Price 1984 (F 199).

⁶⁶ *AE* 1978, 295.

⁶⁷ P. Zanker, in Fittschen and Zanker 1985 (F 365) 1 no. 8, 7ff; Gross 1962 (F 401); Polacco 1955 (F 528).

buildings and of funerary altars retraces the forms worked out in the mid-Augustan period, but less lightly and brightly.

The last years of Tiberius and the ephemeral reign of Caligula show the first skirmishes of a structural crisis in the formal and ideological model established by Augustus, although output continued to develop with explicit or implicit citations of Augustan works; with Claudius and Nero the crisis was finally revealed. In town-planning and architecture,⁶⁸ the innovations which bore the richest implications for the future were those brought about by the definitive centralization in the hands of the *princeps* of all the machinery for carrying out public works, and by the huge, concomitant growth in the parasitic dependence of the urban plebs upon him. Augustus and Tiberius – but especially Augustus – had controlled this trend by diverting their investments into large works which bore witness to their own *pietas*. Claudius, on the other hand, constructed a large new port at the mouth of the Tiber, which joined with the great warehouses and similar edifices at Ostia to facilitate the supply of grain to Rome, and he reorganized the distributions of grain (*frumentationes*) at Rome, unifying in the *porticus Minucia frumentaria* the administrative offices for the distribution of food. Along the same lines of ever more grandiose intervention in the development of the city, are Nero's ambitious projects for urban renewal after the fire of A.D. 64. The very few works actually completed basically comprise the baths and gymnasium, which doubled the capacity of those of Agrippa (perhaps introducing a new type of bath plan, called 'imperial'), and the great market (*macellum magnum*), built on the Caelian Hill next to that dedicated to Livia on the Esquiline. However the triumph of the neo-baroque in this period is seen above all in the creativity of private architecture, especially in plans, and in the new conception of decorative elements. Among the latter, most noticeable is the predilection for rustic ashlar work, rich in chiaroscuro effects, which appears in more than one Claudian monument, from the grand pillared portico of the *Porticus Claudii* to the imposing façade of the Porta Maggiore, and to the substructures of the temple of the Divine Claudius which date from the earliest years of Nero. Even the decorative motifs on friezes and entablatures and on funerary altars and urns lose the stiff and severe execution of the Tiberian period to take on a new and accentuated interest in deep carving and shadows which enlivens garlands, bucrania (cattle skulls), heads of animals at corners, and so forth, thus setting the stage for the Flavian taste in decoration.

But it was in his Golden House that Nero wished to show off all of the advances which had been won in the period of late-republican *luxuria*

⁶⁸ On all Julio-Claudian architecture and town-planning in Rome, see P. Gros, in Gros and Torelli 1988 (A 41) 179ff (with earlier bibliography).

and then frozen in the age of Augustus and Tiberius, and thus to make them live again in the light of a century of experience in building and technology. First we may compare the plan of the *Domus Aurea* with the general conceptions lying behind some of the great private buildings of the emperor Tiberius, that is, the *Domus Tiberiana* at Rome and the Tiberian villas at Sperlonga and Capri. Beginning with the palace at Rome, which has been revealed by recent excavation and study, Tiberian buildings show strong tendencies to centralize spaces and corridors. Functional areas dominate, while only very small separate complexes, intended to enjoy the best panoramic views, seem to be spread about in asymmetrical fashion: the imperial loggia at Capri, for example, or the grotto of Sperlonga. But the *Domus Aurea*, a true and proper *villa urbana* with a baroque taste for painted scenery, has no real centre to its design. It appears rather to be conceived as a cluster of complexes and pavilions of varying character and importance, made up of imperial properties old and new which are unified around an ideal centre, the pool (*stagnum*) of the villa, on the site later to be occupied by the Colosseum. Thus can we in fact reconstruct the immense urban villa of the emperor, even if much of the original conception was later destroyed by the superimpositions of the Flavians, Trajan and Hadrian, which intentionally obliterated the designs developed for the tyrant prince by his *magistri et machinatores*, Severus and Celer (Tac. *Ann.* xv.42). However the thinking behind the project also involved a direct connexion between 'wild' nature (water above all, but also gardens and woods) and separate parts of the villa, which are made to fit in with that nature. That this is so, is confirmed by the embryonic design of Caligula with his ships on the Lake of Nemi – where we see a dramatically astonishing inversion of relationships and values between lake and dwellings – or by Nero's villa at Subiaco. As to the many pavilions and parts of the Golden House, the baroque stamp appears in the famous description of the revolving banquet hall (*cenatio rotunda*), which was set in motion by an appropriate machine and which was rich in symbolic implications (Suet. *Ner.* 31). It is also clear in the layout of its various parts, the best preserved of which is now visible under the Baths of Trajan, in the tendency to break up symmetry and rectilinearity, from the trapezoidal central hallway to the famous nymphaeum known as the Octagonal Room, where the central structure with its side areas designed according to a mixed-line plan reproduces a cupola with pavilions for the first time since the days of the late Republic.

The taste for a residence laid out in relation to a lake is entirely Hellenistic and Alexandrian – in particular, Caligula's idea of the ships on the Lake of Nemi is very Alexandrian, derived from the well-known *thalamegos* ship of Ptolemy IV. This taste is echoed even in the dwellings of the emerging classes in the Italian cities, where the old traditional plan

of the Pompeian *domus*, which was already clearly in decline in the suburban villas of the late Republic and under Augustus, atrophies and quite disappears, to the benefit of areas intended for the *amoenitas* of gardens, of views of the sea, and of dining-rooms under pergolas. With his descendants and successors, the luxury driven from the door by Augustus returns through the window of opulent private consumption.

The baroque and dramatic form was the idiom of this revived *luxuria*. Imperial portraits, soon imitated by private portraits which often followed them slavishly not only in style but even in iconography, reflect the general longing for pathos and effect, by enlivening surfaces which were once so frigid, creating contrasts between scarcely shaded faces and turbulent hairstyles, in a word replacing rigid Tiberian 'fine art' with treatments which were softer and more pathetic and yet which did not – here as in other artistic media – break with the Classicizing essence of the plastic arts. This is especially noticeable in the Medici-Della Valle reliefs,⁶⁹ a splendid series of 'historical' reliefs from the early years of Claudius which were reworked in the Arcus Novus of Diocletian. The monument to which they had belonged was a 'copy' of the Ara Pacis and is generally identified with an Altar of Piety (Ara Pietatis), which is known only from an inscription recorded in a manuscript, although some see it as the Altar of the Julian *Gens* (Ara Gentis Iuliae), which is mentioned in military diplomas as standing on the Capitoline Hill. The parts which survive, and which can be assigned to the enclosure, show processions of magistrates, priests, sacrificers and victims passing in front of certain monuments in Rome, the temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine, the temple of the Divine Augustus also on the Palatine – or, according to some, that of Mars Ultor – and perhaps the temple of Fides on the Capitol. Regardless of who the divinities may be and where the altar stood, the *sacra* certainly refer to the imperial cult, and celebrate the deification of Livia ordered by Claudius immediately after his accession. The imitation of the Augustan model is extremely clear. The surviving fragments all pertain to the procession and they essentially reflect the paratactic composition of the processional frieze of the Ara Pacis. At the same time, in comparison, they innovate with noticeable hints of movement in the figures and especially with the disappearance of the Classicizing neutral background of the frieze: this is replaced by an almost 'plebeian' insistence on the painstakingly architectural depictions of the temples, which are inserted into the picture in order to locate the event precisely. The rendering also of the draperies, of the texture of the hair, and of the surfaces in general shows signs of the new stylistic climate, which appears to have been already active and widespread in A.D. 42–3, according to the dating of the monument which is universally

⁶⁹ Torelli 1982 (F 396) 70ff.

accepted. Comparison with Tiberian monuments, such as the so-called Altar of the Vicomagistri,⁷⁰ and with Augustan, such as the figured frieze on the temple of Apollo Sosianus,⁷¹ shows the gradual abandonment by the Julio-Claudian figurative arts of the model created by Augustus. For the 'staccato' composition and the 'stiacciato' relief of the Augustan monument, we find substituted two finely distinguished planes of representation, with the precise appearance of 'natural perspective' in the full-bodied first plane of representation of the Tiberian altar, and with the rich chiaroscuro of the Claudian relief.

In decorative painting Tiberian Classicism carries on the Augustan heritage, especially in the obliteration of all use of the old Second Style, in order to achieve an air of *maiestas* and *gravitas* in individual reception areas. The old conception which linked the function of an area with the form and quality of its decoration gives way to a Third Style generalization and to the proliferation of copies of Classical paintings at the centre of walls. But, as in the developments which we have seen in architecture and sculpture, in the midst of uniform tapestries barely edged with extremely fragile friezes in the Augustan tradition, there spring up in the high Tiberian period extravagant architectural fantasies, filiform, theatrical wings, and almost metaphysical perspectives made of candelabras: between the end of the reign of Tiberius and the first years of Claudius, these prepare for the birth of the Fourth Style, an expression of the baroque renaissance in the field of decorative painting.⁷² The Fourth Style in fact represents a conscious and deliberate revival of the great architectural paintings and dramatic views of the Second Style; but the revival manifests itself not as a restoration of the realistic values longed for by Vitruvius more than half a century earlier, but as a further accentuation of fantastic, non-realistic, theatrical effects, truly and properly surreal landscapes, in which room is found for candelabras and large paintings, together with figures leaning out which draw attention to and enliven the many superimposed stage-scenes.

The Fourth Style, which revives and mixes themes, elements and languages of the Second and Third Styles, is a 'pictorial asianism', in every way worthy to illustrate the verses of Seneca and Lucan, the coherent formulation of a taste which longed to surpass and to subsume the golden classicism of Augustus.

The nature of this phenomenon of the transformation of taste should be sought not so much in a regular, abstract swing between neoclassical and neobaroque periods in the figurative arts of Rome, although that dialectic did indeed exist, and not only in the Julio-Claudian age. It is

⁷⁰ T Hölscher, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) no. 224, 396ff.

⁷¹ A. Viscogliosi, 1988 (F 443) nos. 31-42, 144ff.

⁷² W. Ehrhardt, *Stilgeschichtliche*, 85ff.

rather to be found above all in the deep crisis within the historical bloc of *tota Italia* which had arisen around Augustus.⁷³ This bloc essentially found its expression in what Bianchi Bandinelli very rightly termed 'the art of the centre of power',⁷⁴ the neoclassicism which gave shape to the accomplishments of the emperor and the upper and middle classes and to the more powerful works commissioned by them, which were closely tied to the workshops or to the architectural and technical models of the capital. But the unity showed cracks from the beginning. While the Augustan programme reached its fulfilment at Rome in the last two decades of the first century B.C., in the cities of northern and central Italy and in the more Romanized provinces of the West (Narbonensis, Baetica, and the eastern coasts of Spain) the old tradition – Hellenistic, baroque, pictorial and full of pathos – remained of central interest to important local patrons:⁷⁵ they continued to employ it in their own self-glorifying monuments and to mix it promiscuously with some of the Classicizing and courtly models from the capital. With the age of Tiberius the separation increases, as the old Hellenistic models of the Italian and provincial periphery lose their Hellenistic patina to reveal a schematic framework of Italic tradition. The 'plebeian' artistic tendencies of local workshops take on substance,⁷⁶ giving voice in a simple and often shapeless language, reminiscent of ancient, central-Italian experiences, to aspirations which were no longer those of the ruling classes of municipal Italy – they were already fully co-opted by 'the centre of power', or else extinct – but which were cherished by wealthy freedmen, now honoured as *augustales* – a concrete artistic counterpart to Trimalchio in Petronius' *Satiricon*. In their eyes this 'plebeian' art served to express aspirations of social ascent and political recognition.

In truth, this very conception of co-optation, which was inherent in the social structure by *ordines* in imperial Rome, undermined the apparently rocklike solidity of the historical Augustan bloc, which tried to model the portrait features of its members on those of the *princeps* and other members of the imperial house, and which meant with the assurance of Classicism to leave behind the uncertainties and the anguish of the overturning of *ordines* which was provoked by *luxuria*, by *lucrum* (avarice), and by the civil wars. With the age of Claudius the erosion of Augustus' social and economic order is quite clear, and the whole framework of the traditional society of *ordines* is in flux, as is shown by

⁷³ On this historical unity: M. Torelli, in *Kaiser Augustus* 1988 (F 443) 23ff.

⁷⁴ Bianchi Bandinelli 1970 (F 275).

⁷⁵ This development is well illustrated by the collective taste for funerary monuments with a doric frieze: Torelli 1969 (E 129).

⁷⁶ The definition is that of R. Bianchi Bandinelli, in *DArch* 1 (1967) 7ff = *Dall'Ellenismo al Medioevo* (Rome, 1978) 35ff (in which version the author adds an Introduction, pp. 3ff, with further definition of the concept).

the beginning of the rapid decline of the economy and social structure of Italian towns, and by the correspondingly rapid ascent of the provincial governing classes of Gaul and Spain. To this great turnover of governing classes is connected a dual and related phenomenon, that is, the rediscovery of formal baroque values in the culture of the court, both literary and artistic, and the formal birth of municipal 'plebeian' art, which lay in its turn at the roots of later provincial art. The cultural background of this new ruling class of Italian and provincial origin was in fact largely to be sought in the ancient formal experiences of its more remote origins, in the baroque and Asian artistic culture still dominant in their areas of origin two generations before, that is, in the world of Caesar and the triumvirs, a world which survived up to the early years of the first century A.D. and was not erased by the 'normalization' imposed by Augustus, as we can see in the art which spread quickly through Cisalpine Italy and Narbonensis in the first centuries B.C. and A.D.⁷⁷ At the same time, there were vacuums of power and of culture left behind by these former provincials in their swift social rise under Augustus and Tiberius, the local representatives of the historical bloc which was the base of the new Principate. These vacuums were filled by lower social classes, which were essentially of freedmen origin and which caused to flourish again even more remote conceptual, ideological and formal experiences, those of the artistic culture of the Romano-Italic *koine*, which expressed better than any other gesture the elements of affirmation of status which were necessary to the self-glorification of the new and powerful Trimalchios.

Therefore, the two greatest historians of Roman art in our century, G. Rodenwaldt and R. Bianchi Bandinelli, spoke rightly of the essentially bipolar nature of art at Rome. To the eternal formal bipolarity between Classicism and the baroque, within which was played out the Augustan experience of official, programmatic art and its crisis in the age of Claudius and Nero, there corresponds the no less eternal bipolarity of mentalities and idioms between 'art of the centre of power' and 'plebeian art'.

⁷⁷ M. Torelli, *Index* 13 (1985) 589ff.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Rome and Italy	The Provinces	Literature, Art and Architecture
B.C.	B.C.	B.C.
44 Assassination of Iulius Caesar (15 March).		44 Cicero's <i>De Officiis</i> . Cicero's <i>Philippic</i> 1 (2 September), <i>Philippic</i> 111 (20 December).
43 Battle of Mutina, deaths of consuls Hirrius and Pansa. Octavian becomes consul (19 August). <i>Lex Titia</i> establishes the triumvirate (27 November).	43 Death of D. Brutus in Gaul.	43 Murder of Cicero. Birth of Ovid.
42 Deification of Iulius Caesar.	42 Sex. Pompeius controls Sicily. Naval battle with Salvidienus Rufus. Illyrian triumph of P. Vatinius (31 July). Battles of Philippi (first early in October, second on 23 October), followed by suicides of Brutus and Cassius.	42 Restoration of the temple of Saturn.
	41 Antony in Asia. Herod and his brother Phasaël appointed tetrarchs of Judaea. Antony meets Cleopatra at Tarsus in winter and proceeds to Alexandria.	41 Virgil, <i>Eclogue</i> IV written for Pollio's consulship of 40.
40 Surrender of Perusia to Octavian by L. Antonius (early spring). Octavian marries Scribonia (summer). Pact of Brundisium (September). Herod granted the throne of Judaea (autumn).	40 Parthian invasion of Syria led by Pacorus and Q. Labienus. Death of King Deiotarus of Galatia. Death of Calenus in Gaul (summer).	
39 Pact of Misenum (spring)	39 Ventidius defeats the Parthians. Agrippa campaigns in Gaul. Antony and Octavia at Athens (winter).	

Rome and Italy

B.C.

- 38 Renewal of triumviral powers for five years from 1 January. Marriage of Octavian and Livia (17 January). Triumph of Ventidius (27 November).
- 37 Pact of Tarentum (summer).
- 36 Removal of Lepidus from triumvirate. Octavian granted *sacrosanctitas* of a tribune.
- 34 Sosius' triumph over Judaea (3 September).
- 33 Octavian's second consulship. Powers of the triumvirate lapse at the end of the year.
- 32 Divorce of Octavia by Antony. Publication of Antony's will by Octavian. Personal oath of loyalty sworn to Octavian in the towns of Italy and the West.
- 31 Octavian's third consulship.
- 30 Octavian offered tribunician *ius auxilii*.
- 29 Closing of the doors of the temple of Janus (11 January). Octavian's triple triumph (13-15 August).

The Provinces

B.C.

- 38 Second victory of Ventidius over Parthians and death of Pacorus. Antony captures Samosata. Sex. Pompeius' success against Octavian off Cumae and in Straits of Messina.
- 37 Capture of Jerusalem by Sosius and formal inauguration of the reign of Herod (July). Appointment of client kings: Archelaus in Cappadocia, Amyntas in Galatia, Polemo in Pontus. Marriage of Antony and Cleopatra at Antioch.
- 36 After initial reverse (August), Octavian defeats Sex. Pompeius at Battle of Naulochus (3 September). Antony's Parthian offensive, failure at siege of Phraata and retreat through Armenia.
- 35 Death of Sex. Pompeius in Asia.
- 35-33 Octavian's campaigns in the Balkans.
- 34 Antony's invasion of Armenia and capture of Artavasdes. Triumph at Alexandria, followed by the 'Donations'.
- 33 Death of Bocchus of Mauretania. Antony remains in Armenia.
- 31 Battle of Actium (2 September).
- 30 Capture of Alexandria by Octavian and suicide of Antony (1 August). Suicide of Cleopatra (10 August).
- 29-28 M. Licinius Crassus pacifies Thrace and defeats Bastarnae.

Literature, Art and Architecture

B.C.

- 38 Publication of Virgil, *Eclogues*.
- 37-36 Varro, *De Re Rustica*. Composition of Horace, *Satires* (37-30).
- 36 Reconstruction of the Regia.
- 35 Death of Sallust.
- 34-33 Agrippa restores aqueducts and adds a fifth (Aqua Iulia).
- 33 Agrippa as aedile revives *lusus Troiae*.
- 32 Restoration of Pompey's Theatre.
- 30 Publication of Horace, *Epodes*.
- 29 Dedication of the temple of Divus Iulius and the Curia Iulia (18 August) and the altar of Victory (28 August). Arch in the Forum

- 28 Octavian and Agrippa share the consular *fasces* and begin *lectio senatus* with a grant of *censoria potestas* (or 29?). Return of control of *aerarium* to the praetors. Octavian becomes *princeps senatus*.
- 27 Octavian appears before the Senate (13 and 16 January). He is given the name of Augustus, the oak wreath, the grant of a *provincia* for a period of ten years, with the right to govern it through *legati*. Triumph of M. Licinius Crassus (4 July).
- 25 Marriage of Julia and Marcellus. Closing of the doors of the temple of Janus. Augustus falls ill.
- 23 Illness of Augustus. He resigns the consulship and on 1 July receives *imperium maius proconsulare* and *tribunicia potestas* for life, the latter renewed annually on 9 December. Death of Marcellus. Agrippa given a grant of *imperium proconsulare*.
- 22 Trial of Marcus Primus and conspiracy of Caepio and Murena. Augustus refuses dictatorship and consulship for life but accepts *cura annonae*.
- 21 Marriage of Agrippa and Julia.

- 28 Inscription of Cornelius Gallus commemorates defeat of revolt in the Egyptian Thebaid and penetration of Roman arms beyond the First Cataract.

27-24 Augustus in Gaul and Spain.

- 26 Dismissal and suicide of Cornelius Gallus (or in 27).

26-25 Campaign of Aelius Gallus to Arabia Felix.

- 25 Juba II made king of Mauretania. Campaigns of M. Terentius Varro in the Val d'Aosta. Death of Amyntas and annexation of Galatia.

25-22 Campaigns of P. Petronius in Ethiopia (or 24-22).

23-21 Agrippa sent out to the East with *imperium*.

22-19 Augustus in Greece and Asia.

to commemorate the victory at Actium. Restoration of temples of Apollo and Hercules Musarum. Completion of Virgil, *Georgics* and Propertius, *Elegies* 1.

- 28 First celebration of the Actian Games (September). Dedication of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine (9 October). Mausoleum of Augustus begun. Composition of Vitruvius' *De Architectura* (28-23).

27 Death of Varro. Agrippa's construction of the Pantheon.

26 Propertius, *Elegies* 11-14 (26-16).

25 Ovid begins writing the *Amores*.

24-23 Publication of Horace, *Odes* 1-111.

23 Maecenas falls out of favour in the imperial court.

22 Temple of Jupiter Tonans on Capitol (1 September).

Rome and Italy

B.C.

- 19 Augustus given a lifetime grant of the right to carry the consular *fascēs* and to sit between the consuls.
- 18 Renewal of the grant of the *provincia* to Augustus. Agrippa's *imperium* is renewed for five years and he is granted *tribunicia potestas*. Another *lectio senatus*.
- 18/17 ?Augustan moral legislation.
- 17 Augustus adopts his grandsons, Gaius and Lucius, the children of Agrippa and Iulia. Celebration of the *Iudi saeculares*.
- 13 Tiberius consul. Death of Lepidus the triumvir. Agrippa's *tribunicia potestas* and *imperium proconsulare* renewed, the latter made *maius*.
- 12 Augustus becomes *pontifex maximus* (6 March). Death of Agrippa (March).

The Provinces

B.C.

- 20 Agrippa deals with trouble in Gaul. Recovery of Roman standards from Parthia. Tiberius crowns Tigranes as king of Armenia.
- 19 Agrippa completes the pacification of Spain. Campaign of L. Cornelius Balbus against the Garamantes in Africa.
- 17-16 Campaigns of P. Silius Nerva in north Italy and the Alps. Defeat of M. Lollius in Gaul.
- 16-13 Augustus in Gaul, Agrippa in the East.
- 15 Tiberius and Drusus invade Bavaria and reach the Danube. Agrippa visits Jerusalem.
- 14 Agrippa appoints Polemo king of Bosphorus.
- 13 Agrippa campaigns in Pannonia.
- 12-9 Tiberius campaigns in the Balkans, Drusus in Germany. Rising in Thrace put down by L. Calpurnius Piso (c. 11-9).
- 12 Dedication of the Altar of the Tres Galliae at Lugdunum (? or 10 B.C., see p.98). Inauguration of Caesarea by Herod.

Literature, Art and Architecture

B.C.

- 20 Dedication of temple of Mars Ultor on the Capitol (12 May). (? Or 19) Publication of Horace, *Epistles* 1.
- 19 Deaths of Virgil (21 September) and Tibullus. Construction of the Aqua Virgo. Arch of Augustus in the Forum to commemorate the recovery of the Parthian standards. Dedication of Altar of Fortuna Redux (15 December).
- 17 Composition of Horace, *Carmen Saeculare*.
- 13 Dedication of the Theatre of Marcellus (or, less probably, 11 B.C.). Inauguration of the Ara Pacis Augustae (4 July).
- 12 Publication of Horace, *Epistles* 11.1. Dedication of temple of Vesta on the Palatine (28 April). Bequest of the Baths of Agrippa to the Roman people.

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>11 Tiberius made to divorce Vipsania and marry Iulia.</p> <p>9 Death of Drusus the Elder (14 September).</p>
<p>8 Census held.</p> <p>7 Tiberius' triumph over the Sugambri. Establishment of the fourteen <i>regiones</i> of Rome.</p> <p>6 Tiberius granted <i>tribunicia potestas</i> for five years. He retires to Rhodes.</p> <p>5 Augustus holds the consulship. C. Caesar assumes the <i>toga virilis</i> and is given the title <i>princeps iuventutis</i>. Beginning of regular appointment of suffect consuls.</p>
<p>2 Augustus holds the consulship again and is given the title of <i>pater patriae</i> (5 February). L. Caesar assumes the <i>toga virilis</i> and is given the title of <i>princeps iuventutis</i>. Iulia exiled. Appointment of first praetorian prefects. Lex Fufia Caninia.</p> | <p>9 Drusus reaches the Elbe but dies after an accident. Altar to Rome and Augustus established at Ara Ubiorum (probably in 9).</p> <p>8 Tiberius campaigns against the Sugambri. Death of Polemo of Pontus.</p> <p>7 Recall of Tiberius.</p>
<p>6 ? Death of Tigranes II of Armenia.</p> <p>5/3 ? War of Sulpicius Quirinius against the Homonadenses.</p>
<p>4 Death of Herod. His kingdom divided between his sons Philip, Herod Antipas and Archelaus.</p> <p>2 Death of Parthian king Phraates IV, succeeded by Phraates V (or Phraataces).</p> | <p>9 Publication of first edition of Ovid, <i>Ars Amatoria</i>. End of Livy's history. Dedication of the Ara Pacis Augustae (30 January).</p> <p>8 Deaths of Maecenas and Horace.</p>

<p>2 Dedication of the <i>Forum Augustum</i> and the temple of Mars Ultor (12 May). Second edition of Ovid, <i>Ars Amatoria</i>.</p> |
|--|--|---|
-
- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>A.D.</p> <p>2 Return of Tiberius from Rhodes.</p> | <p>A.D.</p> <p>1 C. Caesar sent to the East with <i>imperium</i>.</p> <p>2 Agreement between C. Caesar and Phraataces. Ariobarzanes installed as king of Armenia. L. Caesar dies at Massilia. End of Marmaric War in Cyrene (?).</p> | <p>A.D.</p> <p>1-4 Composition of Ovid, <i>Fasti</i>.</p> |
|--|--|---|

Rome and Italy	The Provinces	Literature, Art and Architecture
B.C.	B.C.	B.C.
4 Another <i>lectio senatus</i>. Augustus adopts Agrippa Postumus and Tiberius (26 June), who in turn adopts Germanicus. Tiberius given a further grant of <i>tribunicia potestas</i> for ten years. <i>Lex Aelia Sentia</i>. 6 Establishment of the <i>aerarium militare</i> and of the <i>vigiles</i>. 7 Agrippa Postumus banished to Planasia. 8 Iulia the Younger banished.	4 Death of C. Caesar. Tiberius invades Germany as far as the river Weser. 5 Tiberius reaches the Elbe. 6 Outbreak of revolt in Pannonia and Illyricum. Banishment of Archelaus, son of Herod; Judaea turned into a province (census of Quirinius). Revolt in Isauria. 9 End of the Pannonian revolt. Defeat of P. Quinctilius Varus and loss of three legions in the Teutoburg Forest.	6 Rebuilding of the temple of Castor and Pollux by Tiberius. 8 Banishment of Ovid.
12 Tiberius' Illyrian triumph (23 October). 13 Tiberius given a further grant of <i>tribunicia potestas</i> for ten years and <i>imperium proconsulare maius</i> equal to that of Augustus. Germanicus given a grant of <i>imperium proconsulare</i>. 14 <i>Lustrum</i> held (11 May). Death of Augustus at Nola (19 August). Tiberius becomes <i>princeps</i>. Augustus is granted a public funeral (early September) and voted divine honours (17 September). Death of Agrippa Postumus. 15 Tiberius becomes <i>pontifex maximus</i> (10 March). 16 Conviction for treason (<i>maiestas</i>) of Libo Drusus, great-grandson of Pompey and great-nephew of Augustus' first wife, Scribonia (3 September).	12 Germanicus takes command in Gaul and Germany. 14 Army revolts in Pannonia and on the Rhine, dealt with by Drusus and Germanicus respectively (autumn). 15-16 Germanicus' campaigns in Germany, from which he is recalled by Tiberius.	10 Restoration and dedication of the temple of Concordia by Tiberius.

- 17 Death of Archelaus of Cappadocia. Triumph of Germanicus (26 May).
- 18 Consulship of Tiberius and Germanicus.
- 19/20 Twin sons born to the younger Drusus, of whom only Tiberius Gemellus survives.
- 20 Trial and suicide of Cn. Calpurnius Piso. Triumph of Drusus (28 May).
- 21 Consulship of Tiberius and Drusus. Tiberius retires temporarily to Campania.
- 22 Grant of *tribunicia potestas* for Drusus.
- 23 Death of Drusus (14 September).
- 25 Sejanus' request to marry Livilla (Livilla Iulia), widow of Drusus, is refused.
- 26 Tiberius leaves Rome for Capreae.
- 28 Death of Iulia the Elder. Marriage of Agrippina the Younger to Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus.
- 29 Death of Livilla. Banishment of Agrippina and of Nero, son of Germanicus and Agrippina.
- 30 Suicide of Nero.
- 31 Consulship of Tiberius and Sejanus. Denunciation and death of Sejanus (18 October). Appointment of Sutorius Macro as praetorian prefect. Gaius Caligula assumes *toga virilis*.
- 33 Death of Agrippina (18 October). Death of Drusus. Suicide of Asinius Gallus. Quaes-torship of Gaius.
- 17 Outbreak of war against Tacfarinas in Numidia. Germanicus sent to the East with *imperium*. Cappadocia becomes a province. Commagene also annexed.
- 18-19 Germanicus visits Egypt.
- 19 Death of Germanicus at Antioch (10 October). Death of Arminius.
- 21 Revolt of Florus and Sacrovir in Gaul.
- 24 Defeat and death of Tacfarinas.
- 26 (?) Pontius Pilate becomes *praefectus* of Judaea.
- 28 Revolt of the Frisii.
- 17 Death of Livy. Death of Ovid (?). Dedi-cation of temple of Janus (18 October) and Fors Fortuna.
- 21-2 Building of *castra praetoria*.
- 30 Publication of Velleius Paterculus' history.
- 33 (?) Death of Philip, son of Herod; his tetrarchy is taken under direct rule.
- 34 Death of Artaxias of Armenia.

Rome and Italy

B.C.

- 37 Death of Tiberius at Misenum (16 March). Gaius Caligula acclaimed *princeps* (18 March), confirmed by the Senate (28 March). Death of Antonia the Younger (1 May). Claudius consul with Gaius (1 July – 31 August). Suicide of Tiberius Gemellus. Illness of Gaius (autumn). Birth of Nero (15 December).
- 38 Death and deification of Drusilla (10 June, 23 September). Gaius marries Lollia Paulina.
- 39 Gaius divorces Lollia Paulina and marries Milonia Caesonia. Leaves Rome (September). Claudius marries Messallina.
- 40 Gaius returns to Rome (31 August).
- 41 Murder of Gaius (24 January). Proclamation of Claudius (25 January). Birth of Britannicus.
- 42 Claudius proclaimed *pater patriae* (12 January).
- 44 *Aerarium* transferred from praetors to quaestors. Claudius' triumph for conquest of Britain.

The Provinces

B.C.

- 36 Pontius Pilate removed from his post for maladministration by L. Vitellius, governor of Syria.
- 37 Herod Agrippa I given Philip's kingdom.
- 38 Trouble between the Jewish and Greek communities in Alexandria.
- 39 Herod Antipas deposed. Gaius visits the Rhineland (October). Conspiracy and execution of Gaetulicus.
- 40 Herod Antipas' ethnarchy given to Herod Agrippa I. Gaius in Gaul (winter). Preparations for an invasion of Britain. Outbreak of rebellion in Mauretania. Gaius orders his statue to be placed in the Temple at Jerusalem.
- 40–4 Conquest of Mauretania and organization of provinces of Tingitana and Caesariensis.
- 41 Claudius' letter to the Alexandrians.
- 42 Conspiracy and death of Scribonianus.
- 43 Invasion of Britain. Lycia-Pamphylia made a province.
- 44 Death of Herod Agrippa I.

Literature, Art and Architecture

B.C.

- 37 Dedication of the temple of Divus Augustus.
- 41 Beginning of the construction of a new harbour at Ostia and of the draining of the Fucine Lake. Seneca sent into exile.

- 47 Ovation of Aulus Plautius for conquest of Britain.
- 47-8 Censorship of Claudius and L. Vitellius. Celebration of *ludi saeculares*.
- 48 'Marriage' and execution of Messallina and C. Silius.
- 49 Marriage of Claudius and Agrippina the Younger (1 January). Extension of the *pomerium* of Rome. Seneca returns from exile and becomes praetor and tutor of Nero.
- 50 Claudius adopts Nero (25 February). Agrippina becomes Augusta.
- 51 Burrus becomes praetorian prefect. Nero given the title of *princeps iuventutis*.
- 53 Nero marries Octavia.
- 54 Death of Claudius (13 October), accession of Nero.
- 55 Death of Britannicus.
- 56 Nero given the title of *pater patriae*. *Aerarium* transferred from quaestors to *praefecti*.
- 58 Rejection of proposal that Nero should be *consul perpetuus*.
- 59 Murder of Agrippina. Institution of *Iuvenalia*.
- 60 Institution of the *Neronia*.
- 46 Annexation of Thrace.
- 47 Corbulo in the Rhineland.
- 49 Agrippa II given the kingdom of Chalcis.
- 51 Ostorius Scapula defeats Caratacus. Death of Gotarzes of Parthia, succeeded by Vonones and then Vologaeses.
- 53 Parthians take control of Armenia and Tiridates is appointed to the throne.
- 55 Corbulo appointed to an eastern command against Parthia and Armenia.
- 58 Corbulo attacks Tiridates and captures Artaxata.
- 59 Capture of Tigranocerta by Corbulo.
- 60 Completion of the subjugation of Armenia and appointment to the throne of Tigranes, great-grandson of Herod and of Archelaus of Cappadocia. Corbulo appointed governor of Syria. Revolt of Boudica and the Iceni.
- 51-2 Dedication of the Triumphal Arch of Claudius, forming part of the Aqua Virgo.
- 54 Publication of Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*.
- 55 Publication of Seneca, *De Clementia*.
- 56-7 Dedication of the Macellum Magnum.

Rome and Italy	The Provinces	Literature, Art and Architecture
B.C.	B.C.	B.C.
62 Nero divorces Octavia and marries Poppaea Sabina. Execution of Octavia (9 June). Death of Burrus, retirement of Seneca. Introduction of <i>maiestas</i> charges.	61 Tigranes invades Adiabene. Vologaeses threatens Syria.	62 Construction of the <i>Thermae Neronianae</i> (or possibly 64).
63 Birth and death of daughter of Nero and Poppaea, deified as Claudia Augusta.	62 Caesennius Pactus sent to Cappadocia. Surrenders to Vologaeses at Rhandaia.	
64 Outbreak of fire in Rome (18/19 July). Victimization of the Christians. Reform of the currency.	64-5 Incorporation of kingdom of Pontus into Galatia.	64 Destruction of the <i>Domus Transitoria</i> .
65 <i>Neronia</i> held again. Conspiracy of Piso (April). Death of Seneca. Death of Poppaea Sabina.		64-8 Building of the <i>Domus Aurea</i> , rebuilding of the Circus Maximus and reconstruction of Rome.
66 Deaths of Thrasea Pactus and Barea Soranus. Conspiracy of Vinicianus. Nero marries Stailia Messallina. Tiridates crowned king of Armenia in Rome.	66 Nero proclaims the freedom of Greece (? or 67, see p.664). Conspiracy and deaths of the Scribonii brothers. Corbulo instructed to commit suicide. Outbreak of revolt in Judaea.	65 Deaths of Seneca and Lucan.
68 Nero returns to Italy and while in Naples receives news of the revolt of Vindex. Death of Nero (9 or possibly 11 June). Proclamation of Galba as <i>princeps</i> . Galba arrives at Rome (autumn).	67 Vespasian appointed as legate in command of the war in Judaea (February).	66 Death of Petronius.
69 Otho proclaimed <i>princeps</i> by the praetorian guard (15 January). Murder of Galba. Otho defeated by Vitellius' troops at Bedriacum (14 April) and commits suicide (16 April). Vitellius granted imperial powers by the Senate (19 April) and enters Rome (June).	68 Vespasian reduces Samaria and Idumaea and prepares to attack Jerusalem. Revolt of Vindex in Gaul. Galba acclaimed by his troops in Spain (2 or 3 April). Battle of Vesontio and suicide of Vindex (late spring). Revolt of Clodius Macer in Africa.	
	69 German legions in revolt against Galba. Vitellius proclaimed emperor by the German legions. Revolt of Civilis and the Batavians. Vespasian proclaimed emperor at Alexandria (1 July) and then by the army in Syria and Judaea.	

Second battle of Cremona (24/25 Octob
Antonius Primus enters Rome, murde
Vitellius (20 or 21 December)

- 70 Mucianus arrives in Rome (January).¹
pasian confirmed by the Senate as *prin*.
Publication of the *lex de imperio Vespas*
Domitian made urban praetor with
imperium of a consul. Arrival of Vespa
in Rome (summer).

- 70 *Imperium Galliarum* of Iulius Classicus and
Iulius Tutor. Petilius Cerialis defeats the
Batavian revolt. Titus attacks and captures
Jerusalem and destroys the Temple
(August).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

AA	<i>Archäologischer Anzeiger</i>
AA ^{&} A	<i>Antike und Abendland</i>
AAES	<i>Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria 1899-1900.</i> New York
AAntHung	<i>Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>
AArchHung	<i>Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>
AAS	<i>Annales archéologiques arabes syriennes</i>
AAWM	<i>Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Mainz, geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse</i>
ABAW	<i>Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i>
ABSA	<i>Annual of the British School at Athens</i>
AC	<i>L'Antiquité classique</i>
AClass	<i>Acta Classica. Proceedings of the Classical Association of South Africa</i>
<i>Acta ArchLov</i>	<i>Acta Archaeologica Lovanensia</i>
ADA	S. Riccobono, <i>Acta Divi Augusti.</i> Rome, 1945
AE	<i>L'année épigraphique</i>
AEA	<i>Archivo Español de Arqueología</i>
AFLN	<i>Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia della Università di Napoli</i>
AHB	<i>Ancient History Bulletin</i>
AHDE	<i>Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español</i>
AION (Archaeol.)	<i>Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli. Seminario di Studi del Mondo classico. Sezione di Archeologia e Storia antica.</i>
AJ	F. F. Abbott, A. C. Johnson, <i>Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire.</i> Princeton, 1926
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AJAH	<i>American Journal of Ancient History</i>
AJPb	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AJS Review	<i>Journal of the Association for Jewish Studies</i>
AN	D. C. Braund, <i>Augustus to Nero: A Sourcebook on Roman History 31 B.C. - A.D. 68.</i> London and Sydney, 1985

<i>AncSoc</i>	<i>Ancient Society</i>
<i>AncW</i>	<i>Ancient World</i>
<i>Annales ESC</i>	<i>Annales (Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations)</i>
<i>AnnDept.AntiqJordan</i>	<i>Annual of the Jordan Department of Antiquities</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	H. Temporini, W. Haase (eds.), <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Berlin and New York, 1972—
<i>Ant.Afr</i>	<i>Antiquités africaines</i>
<i>APF</i>	<i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung</i>
<i>AR</i>	<i>Africa romana</i>
<i>ArchCant</i>	<i>Archaeologia Cantiana</i>
<i>ArchClass</i>	<i>Archaeologia Classica</i>
<i>ArchJug</i>	<i>Archaeologia Iugoslavica</i>
<i>ArchLaz</i>	<i>Archaeologia Laziale</i>
<i>ArchRep</i>	<i>Archaeological Reports</i> . London, Council of the Society of Hellenic Studies and Management Committee of the British School of Archaeology at Athens
<i>ArchS</i>	<i>Archäologie der Schweiz</i>
<i>ArhVestnik</i>	<i>Arheološki Vestnik</i>
<i>ARID</i>	<i>Analecta Romana Instituti Danici</i>
<i>ARS</i>	A. C. Johnson <i>et al.</i> , <i>Ancient Roman Statutes</i> . Austin, 1961
<i>ASAA</i>	<i>Annuario della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente</i>
<i>ASAW</i>	<i>Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig</i>
<i>ASNP</i>	<i>Annali della Scuola Normale di Pisa, classe di lettere e filosofia</i>
<i>ASS</i>	<i>Archivio Storico Siciliano</i>
<i>AU</i>	<i>Der altsprachliche Unterricht</i>
<i>AW</i>	<i>Antike Welt</i>
<i>BAA</i>	<i>Bulletin d'archéologie algérienne</i>
<i>BABesch</i>	<i>Bulletin Antieke Beschaving</i>
<i>BAGB</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé</i>
<i>BAR</i>	<i>British Archaeological Reports</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem and Baghdad</i>
<i>BASP</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
<i>BayVorgeschichtsbld</i>	<i>Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter</i>
<i>BCAR</i>	<i>Bollettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale in Roma</i>
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i>
<i>BdA</i>	<i>Bollettino d'Arte del Ministero per i beni culturali e ambientali</i>
<i>BEFAR</i>	<i>Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome</i>
<i>BGU</i>	<i>Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden</i> . Berlin, 1895—

BIAL	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology of the University of London</i>
BiAr	<i>The Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BICS	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London</i>
BIDR	<i>Bullettino dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano</i>
BJ	<i>Bonner Jahrbücher</i>
BMCPhoenicia	<i>Catalogue of Greek Coins in the British Museum, Phoenicia. London, 1910</i>
BMCRE	H. Mattingly <i>et al.</i> , <i>Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum. London, 1923-</i>
BMCRR	H. A. Grueber, <i>Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum. London, 1910</i>
BRGK	<i>Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i>
BSAO	<i>Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de l'Ouest</i>
BSEAA	<i>Boletín del Seminario de Estudios de Arte y Arqueología, Valladolid</i>
BSNAF	<i>Bulletin de la société nationale des antiquaires de France</i>
Bull.ép	J. and L. Robert, <i>Bulletin épigraphique. Paris, 1972-</i>
BzN	<i>Beiträge zur Namenforschung</i>
CAH	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i>
CAR	<i>Cahiers d'archéologie Romande</i>
CBA ResRep	<i>Council for British Archaeology, Research Reports</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CCG	<i>Cahiers du Centre G. Glotz</i>
CE	<i>Chronique d'Egypte</i>
CbLA	A. Bruckner, R. Marichal, <i>Chartae Latinae Antiquiores. Olten and Lausanne, 1954-</i>
CHM	<i>Cahiers d'histoire mondiale</i>
CIA	W. Dittenberger, A. Kirchhoff, J. Kirchner, U. Koehler, <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum. Berlin, 1873-95</i>
CIG	A. Boeckh, <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum. Berlin, 1828-77</i>
CIJ	J. B. Frey, <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum. Rome, 1936-75</i>
CIL	T. Mommsen <i>et al.</i> , <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Berlin, 1863-</i>
CIS	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum. Paris, 1881-1951</i>
CISA	<i>Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia Antica dell'Università del Sacro Cuore, Milano</i>
CJ	P. Krüger, <i>Codex Justinianus, 1877</i>
ClAnt	<i>Classical Antiquity</i>
ClassJ	<i>Classical Journal</i>
C&M	<i>Classica et Mediaevalia</i>
CPb	<i>Classical Philology</i>

CPJ	V. A. Tcherikover <i>et al.</i> , <i>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum</i> . Jerusalem, 1957-64
CPL	R. Cavenaile, <i>Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum</i> . Wiesbaden, 1958
CQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
CR	<i>Classical Review</i>
CRAI	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres</i>
CRR	E. A. Sydenham, <i>The Coinage of the Roman Republic</i> . London, 1952
CSCA	<i>California Studies in Classical Antiquity</i>
CSDIR	<i>Centro Studi e Documentazione sull'Italia Romana</i>
CSSH	<i>Comparative Studies in Society and History</i>
CTh	T. Mommsen, <i>Codex Theodosianus</i> . Berlin, 1905
CV	<i>Classical Views</i> [= EMC]
D	T. Mommsen, <i>Digesta Justiniani Augusti</i> . Berlin, 1870
DAF	<i>Documents d'archéologie française</i>
DArch	<i>Dialoghi di archeologia</i>
DE	E. de Ruggiero, <i>Dizionario Epigrafico di antichità romana</i> , Rome, 1895-1988
DHA	<i>Dialogues d'histoire ancienne</i>
Diadora	<i>Glasilo arheološkoga Muzeja u Zadru</i>
EA	<i>Epigraphica Anatolica</i>
EEA	<i>Enciclopedia d'arte antica</i> . Rome, 1958-85
EE	<i>Ephemeris Epigraphica. Corporis inscriptionum Latinarum supplementum</i> , edita iussu Instituti Archaeologici Romani. Berlin, 1872-9, 1903-13
EJ ²	V. Ehrenberg, A. H. M. Jones, <i>Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius</i> . 2nd edn. Oxford, 1975
EL	<i>Etudes de lettres. Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Lausanne et de la Société des Etudes et Lettres</i>
EMC	<i>Echos du monde classique</i> [= CV]
Entretiens Hardt	<i>Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique</i> , Fondation Hardt. Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1952 -
EPRO	<i>Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain</i>
EpStud	<i>Epigraphische Studien</i>
EtPap	<i>Etudes de Papyrologie</i>
ESAR	T. Frank <i>et al.</i> , <i>An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome</i> . 5 vols. Baltimore, 1933-40
FGrH	F. Jacoby, <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . Berlin and Leiden, 1923 -
FHG	C. Müller, <i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> . Paris, 1841-70
FIRA	S. Riccobono <i>et al.</i> , <i>Fontes Iuris Romani Antejustiniani</i> .

- 2nd edn. Florence 1940-3
- GB *Grazer Beiträge*
- GCN E. M. Smallwood, *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero*. Cambridge, 1967
- GGA *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*
- GJ *Geographical Journal*
- G&R *Greece and Rome*
- GRBS *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*
- GWU *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*
- GZMS *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine: Arheologija*
- HABES *Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien*
- Habis *Habis: arqueología, filología clásica*. Sevilla, Universidad
- HSCP *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
- HTR *Harvard Theological Review*
- ICS *Illinois Classical Studies*
- IDR D. M. Pippidi, I. I. Russu, *Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae*. Bucharest, 1977-
- IEJ *Israel Exploration Journal*
- IFAO *Mémoires* Institut français d'archéologie orientale, *Mémoires*
- IG A. Kirchhoff et al., *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Berlin 1873-
- IGBulg G. Mihailov, *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae*. Sofia, 1956-66
- IGLS L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde et al., *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*. Beirut, Paris, 1929- [see also IJord]
- IGRR R. Cagnat et al., *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes*. Paris, 1901-27
- IItal V. Bracco et al., *Inscriptiones Italiae*. Rome, 1931-
- IJ *Irish Jurist*
- IJord P.-L. Gatier, *Inscriptions de la Jordanie*. 2, *Amman, Ammanitis et Jordan central*, Paris, 1986 [= IGLS vol. xxi]
- ILAfr R. Cagnat, A. Merlin, L. Chatelain, *Inscriptions latines d'Afrique (Tripolitanie, Tunisie et Maroc)*. Paris, 1923
- ILAlg S. Gsell, H.-G. Pflaum, *Inscriptiones latines de l'Algérie*. Paris, 1922-
- ILER J. Vives, *Inscripcions latinas de la España romana*. Barcelona, 1971-2
- ILGN *Inscriptiones latines de la Gaule Narbonnaise* I, J. Gasco, M. Janon. Fréjus, 1985
- ILGR M. Šašel Kos, *Inscriptiones Latinae in Graecia repertae: additamenta ad CIL III*. Faenza, 1979
- ILJug A. and J. Šašel, *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia ... repertae et editae sunt*. Inter annos MCMXL et MCMLX (Situla 5, 1963); Inter MCMLX et MCMLXX (Situla 19, 1978); Inter MCMII et MCMXL (Situla 25, 1986). Ljubljana

ILLRP	A. Degraasi, <i>Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae</i> . 2nd edn. 2 vols. Florence, 1957-63
ILS	H. Dessau, <i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i> . 3 vols. Berlin 1892-1916
ILTG	P. Willeumier, <i>Inscriptions latines des Trois Gaules</i> (<i>Gallia</i> suppl. XVII, Paris, 1963)
ILTun	A. Merlin, <i>Inscriptions latines de la Tunisie</i> . Paris, 1944
IMagnesia	O. Kern, <i>Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander</i> . Berlin, 1900
IMS	F. Papazoglu, <i>Inscriptions de la Mésie supérieure</i> . Belgrade, 1976-
InscrCret	M. Guarducci, <i>Inscriptiones Creticae</i> . Rome, 1935-50
IPhil	A. and E. Bernand, <i>Inscriptions grecques de Philae</i> . Paris, 1969
IRB	S. Mariner-Bigorra, <i>Inscripciones romanas de Barcelona lapidarias y musivas</i> . Barcelona, 1973
IRC	G. Fabre, M. Mayer, I. Roda, <i>Inscriptions romaines de Catalogne I: Barcelone sauf Barcino</i> . Paris, 1984-5
IRPC	J. González, <i>Inscripciones romanas de la Provincia de Cádiz</i> . Cádiz, 1982
IRT	J. M. Reynolds, J. B. Ward-Perkins, <i>The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania</i> . Rome, 1952
ISM	D. M. Pippidi, I. I. Russu, <i>Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris Graecae et Latinae</i> , 1-1. Bucharest, 1980-
JACTJ	<i>Journal of the Joint Association of Classical Teachers</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JbAW	<i>Jahrbuch der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JDAI	<i>Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i>
JEa	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
JFA	<i>Journal of Field Archaeology</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
JJP	<i>Journal of Juristic Papyrology</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JNG	<i>Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte</i>
JÖAI	<i>Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien</i> . Vienna 1898-
JR	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
JRA	<i>Journal of Roman Archaeology</i>
JRGeogS	<i>Journal of the Royal Geographical Society</i>
JRS	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
JS	<i>Journal des Savants</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LA	<i>Libya Antiqua</i>
LCM	<i>Liverpool Classical Monthly</i>

LEC	<i>Les études classiques</i>
LF	<i>Listy Filologické</i>
LS	<i>Libyan Studies</i>
MAAR	<i>Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome</i>
MAI	<i>Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres</i>
MAL	<i>Memorie dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, classe di scienze morali e storiche</i>
MAMA	W. M. Calder, <i>Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiquae</i> . Manchester, 1928—
MCbr	L. Mitteis, <i>Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, Juristischer Teil</i> , II. Leipzig-Berlin, 1912
MDAI (D)	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Station Damaskus)</i>
MDAI (I)	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Abteilung Istanbul)</i>
MDAI (M)	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Abteilung Madrid)</i>
MDAI(R)	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (Römische Abteilung)</i>
MdI	<i>Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts</i>
MEFRA	<i>Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'école française de Rome</i>
MH	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
Milet	<i>Milet</i> 1. Berlin, 1908—28
MMAI	<i>Monuments et mémoires publiés par l'Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres</i>
MonArtAnt	<i>Monumenta artis antiquae</i>
MPhL	<i>Museum Philologicum Londiniense</i>
MPAA	<i>Atti della Pontificia Accademia romana di Archeologia, Ser. IIIa, Memorie</i>
MRR	T. R. S. Broughton, <i>The Magistrates of the Roman Republic</i> (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, no. 15, Cleveland, 1951—86)
MUSJ	<i>Mélanges de l'Université St Joseph</i>
MW	M. McCrum and A. G. Woodhead, <i>Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors</i> . Cambridge, 1961
MZ	<i>Mainzer Zeitschrift</i>
NC	<i>Numismatic Chronicle</i>
NSc	<i>Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità</i>
NTH	E. M. Smallwood, <i>Documents Illustrating the Principates of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian</i> . Cambridge, 1966
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OGIS	W. Dittenberger, <i>Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae</i> . 4 vols. Leipzig, 1903—5
ORF	H. Malcovati, <i>Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta</i> , 3rd edn. Turin, 1967

ORom	<i>Opuscula Romana: Acta Instituti Romani Regni Seuciaie</i>
PAAJR	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research</i>
PACA	<i>Proceedings of the African Classical Associations</i>
PAES	<i>Syria: Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1904-5 and 1909. Leiden</i>
PAPhs	<i>Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society</i>
PBA	<i>Proceedings of the British Academy</i>
PBSR	<i>Papers of the British School at Rome</i>
PCPhS	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</i>
PDura	C. B. Welles, R. O. Fink, J. F. Gilliam, <i>The Excavations at Dura-Europos, Final Report v, Part I, The Parchments and Papyri</i> . New Haven, 1959.
PECS	R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald, M. H. McAllister, <i>Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites</i> . Princeton, 1976
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PFay	B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, D. G. Hogarth, <i>Fayum Towns and their Papyri</i> . London, 1900
PIR	E. Klebs <i>et al.</i> , <i>Prosopographia Imperii Romani</i> . Berlin 1897-8; 2nd edn, 1933-
PKöln	<i>Die Kölner Papyri</i> . Opladen 1975-
PMich	C. C. Edgar, A. E. R. Boak, J. G. Winter <i>et al.</i> , <i>Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection</i> . Ann Arbor, 1931-
POxy	<i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> . London, 1898-
PP	<i>La parola del passato</i>
P&P	<i>Past and Present</i>
PRyl	A. S. Hunt, J. de M. Johnson, V. Martin, C. H. Roberts, E. G. Turner, <i>Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester</i> . Manchester, 1911-52
PYadin	N. Lewis, Y. Yadin, J. C. Greenfield, <i>The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Greek Papyri (including Aramaic and Nabataean Signatures and Subscriptions)</i> . Jerusalem, 1989
QAL	<i>Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia</i>
QS	<i>Quaderni di Storia</i>
QTic	<i>Quaderni Ticinesi</i>
RA	<i>Revue archéologique</i>
RAC	<i>Revue archéologique du centre de la France consacrée aux antiquités nationales de Auvergne etc.</i>
RAL	<i>Rendiconti dell' Accademia dei Lincei, Classe di Scienze moral, storiche e filologiche</i>
RAN	<i>Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise</i>
RBPb	<i>Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire</i>
RCCM	<i>Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale</i>
RDGE	R. K. Sherck, <i>Roman Documents from the Greek East</i> . Baltimore, 1969

RDM	<i>Revue des Deux Mondes</i>
RE	A. F. von Pauly et al., <i>Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> . Stuttgart 1894-
REA	<i>Revue des études anciennes</i>
REG	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
REL	<i>Revue des études latines</i>
RevAfr	<i>Revue africaine</i>
RevArchOuest	<i>Revue archéologique de l'Ouest</i>
RFIC	<i>Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica</i>
RG	<i>Res Gestae Divi Augusti</i>
RHD	<i>Revue de l'histoire du droit</i> (= <i>Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis</i>)
RHDFE	<i>Revue historique de droit français et étranger</i>
RbM	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
RIB	R. G. Collingwood, R. P. Wright, <i>Roman Inscriptions of Britain</i> . Oxford, 1965-
RIC	H. B. Mattingly, E. A. Sydenham, <i>Roman Imperial Coinage</i> . London, 1923-
RIDA	<i>Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité</i>
RIG	<i>Recueil des inscriptions gauloises</i> (Gallia, Suppl. 45, Paris, 1985 -: P.-M. Duval, G. Pinault, <i>Les Calendriers</i> , 1985; M. Lejeune, <i>Textes gallo-étrusques, Textes gallo-latins sur pierre</i> , 1988)
RIL	<i>Rendiconti del Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere, Classe di lettere</i>
RIU	L. Barkóczi, A. Mócsy, <i>Die römische Inschriften Ungarns</i> . Budapest, 1972-
RivArchCr	<i>Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana</i>
RMD	M. M. Roxan, <i>Roman Military Diplomas, 1954-77 and 1977-84</i> (University of London, Institute of Archaeology, Occasional Publications, nos. 2 and 9, 1978 and 1985)
RMR	R. O. Fink, <i>Roman Military Records on Papyrus</i> (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, no. 26, Cleveland, 1971)
RN	<i>Revue numismatique</i>
RPAA	<i>Rendiconti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia</i>
RPh	<i>Revue de Philologie</i>
RRC	M. H. Crawford, <i>Roman Republican Coinage</i> . Cambridge, 1976
RSA	<i>Rivista storica dell'antichità</i>
RSI	<i>Rivista storica italiana</i>
RV	<i>Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten</i>
SB	F. Preisigke, F. Bilabel, <i>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten</i> . Strassburg 1915-
SB.AW	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philos.-hist. Klasse</i>

SCI	<i>Scripta Classica Israelica</i>
SCO	<i>Studi Classici e Orientali</i>
SDHI	<i>Studia et documenta historiae et iuris</i>
SE	<i>Studi Etruschi</i>
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>
SIG ³	W. Dittenberger, <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , 3rd edn. 4 vols. Leipzig 1915-24
SMSR	<i>Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni</i>
SNG von Aulock	<i>Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum, Deutschland, Sammlung von Aulock</i>
SP	A. S. Hunt, C. C. Edgar, <i>Select Papyri</i> . London and New York, 1932-4
StClasice	<i>Studii Clasice</i>
SymbOsl	<i>Symbolae Osloenses</i>
SZ	see ZRG
TabPomp	L. Bove, <i>Documenti processuali dalle Tabulae Pompeianae di Murecine</i> . Naples, 1979
TabVindol	A. K. Bowman, J. D. Thomas, <i>Vindolanda: the Latin Writing-Tablets</i> (Britannia Monograph Series no. 4, London, 1983)
TAM	E. Kalinka et al., <i>Tituli Asiae Minoris</i> . Vienna, 1901-
TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
TLL	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i> , Leipzig 1890-
TransPhilSoc	<i>Transactions of the Philological Society</i>
UBHJ	<i>University of Birmingham Historical Journal</i>
V.AHD	<i>Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku</i> (continuation of Bull. Dalm.)
Verhand.AkWel	<i>Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Akademie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren</i>
WChr	U. Wilcken, <i>Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde, Historischer Teil</i> , II. Leipzig-Berlin, 1912
WJA	<i>Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft</i>
WS	<i>Wiener Studien</i>
YCS	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>
ZDPaV	<i>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
ZRG	<i>Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte</i>

A. GENERAL STUDIES

1. Abaecherli Boyce, A. 'The origin of ornamenta triumphalia', *CPh* 37 (1942) 130-41
2. Balsdon, J. P. V. D. *Romans and Aliens*. London, 1979
3. Beard, M. and Crawford, M. H. *Rome in the Late Republic*. London, 1985
4. Beloch, K. H. *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Leipzig, 1886
5. Béranger, J. *Recherches sur l'aspect idéologique du principat*. Basel, 1953

6. Blagg, T. and Millet, M. (eds.) *The Early Roman Empire in the West*. Oxford, 1990
7. Bradford, J. S. *Ancient Landscapes*. London, 1957
8. Braund, D. C. *Augustus to Nero: a Sourcebook on Roman History 31 B.C.-A.D. 68*. London and Sydney, 1985
9. Brunt, P. A. *Italian Manpower 225 B.C.-A.D. 14*. Oxford, 1971
10. Brunt, P. A. Review of Syme, R. *Roman Papers* III (Oxford, 1984), CR 34 (1984) 349-50
11. Brunt, P. A. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford, 1988
12. Brunt, P. A. *Roman Imperial Themes*. Oxford, 1990
13. Cairns, F. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh, 1972
14. Charles-Picard, G. *Augustus and Nero. The Secret of Empire* (transl. by L. Ortzen). London, 1966
15. Chaumont, M. 'L'Arménie entre Rome et l'Iran. 1. De l'avènement d'Auguste à l'avènement de Dioclétien', *ANRW* II, 9.1 (1976) 71-194
16. Chisholm, K. and Ferguson, J. *The Augustan Age*. Oxford, 1981
17. Clark, C. G. and Haswell, M. R. *The Economics of Subsistence Agriculture*. 4th edn. London, 1970
18. Corradi, G. *Studi ellenistici*. Turin, 1929
19. Debevoise, N. C. *A Political History of Parthia*. Chicago, 1938; repr. 1968
20. Deroux, C. (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* (Coll. Latomus 164, 168, 180, 196) Brussels, 1979-86
21. Dilke, O. A. W. *The Roman Land Surveyors*. Newton Abbot, 1971
22. Dudley, D. R. *Urbs Roma*. London, 1967
23. Dudley, D. R. (ed.) *Silver Latin: 1. Neronians and Flavians*. London, 1972
24. Duncan-Jones, R. *The Economy of the Roman Empire. Quantitative Studies*. Cambridge 1974, 2nd edn 1982
25. Dyson, S. L. 'Native revolts in the Roman Empire', *Hist.* 20 (1971) 239-74
26. Esser, A. *Cäsar und die julisch-claudischen Kaiser im biologisch-ärztlichen Blickfeld* (*Janus Suppl.* 1). Leiden, 1958
27. Finley, M. I. (ed.) *Studies in Roman Property*. Cambridge, 1976
28. Finley, M. I. *Politics in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, 1983
29. Fraser, P. M. and Matthews, E. (eds.) *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, 1. Oxford, 1987
30. Friedlaender, L. *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*. 10th edn. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1922
31. Gabba, E. 'The historians and Augustus', in C 176 61-88
32. Gapp, K. S. 'Famine in the Roman world from the founding of Rome to the time of Trajan'. Diss., Princeton, 1934
33. Garnsey, P. *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis*. Cambridge, 1988
34. Garnsey, P. and Saller, R. *The Roman Empire. Economy, Society and Culture*. London, 1987
35. Garzetti, A. *From Tiberius to the Antonines* (English transl.). London, 1974
36. Gaudemet, J. 'A propos d'un "héritage" romain des monarchies

- hellénistiques', *Ktema* 3 (1978) 165-75 (= *Les gouvernants à Rome* (Antiqua 31) 133-43. Naples, 1985)
37. Gianfrotta, P.-A. and Pomey, P. *Archeologia subacquea*. Milan, 1981
 38. Gilbert, R. *Die Beziehungen zwischen Prinzipats und stadtrömischer Plebs im frühen Prinzipat*. Bochum, 1976
 39. Giovannini, A. *Consulare Imperium* (Schweiz. Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 16). Basel, 1983
 - 39A. Gold, B. K. (ed.) *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome*. Austin, TX, 1982
 40. Greene, K. *The Archaeology of the Roman Economy*. London, 1986
 41. Gros, P. and Torelli, M. *Storia dell'urbanistica. Il mondo romano*. Bari, 1988
 42. Hackett, J. *Warfare in the Ancient World*. London, 1989
 43. Hammond, M. *The Antonine Monarchy*. Rome, 1959
 44. Hatzfeld, J. *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénique*. Paris, 1919
 45. Hopkins, K. *Conquerors and Slaves. Sociological Studies in Roman History* 1. Cambridge, 1978
 46. Hopkins, K. *Death and Renewal. Sociological Studies in Roman History* II. Cambridge, 1983
 47. Jones, A. H. M. *Studies in Roman Government and Law*. Oxford, 1960
 48. Jones, A. H. M. *The Roman Economy, Studies in Ancient Economic and Administrative History* (ed. P.A. Brunt). Oxford, 1974
 49. Juster, J. *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*. 2 vols. Paris, 1914
 50. Kähler, H. *Rom und seine Welt*. 2 vols. Munich, 1958-60
 51. Kähler, H. *Rom und sein Imperium*. Baden-Baden, 1962 (= *Rome and her Empire*. London, 1963)
 52. Kloft, H. 'Aspekte der Prinzipatsideologie im frühen Prinzipat', *Gymn.* 91 (1984) 307-26
 53. Kraft, K. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur antiken Geschichte und Militärgeschichte*. Darmstadt, 1973
 54. Kroll, W. *Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit*. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1933 (reissued in 1 vol., 1963)
 - 54A. *Die Kultur der augusteischen Zeit* (collected papers of a conference) *Klio* 67.1 (1985)
 55. Kunkel, W. *Kleine Schriften*. Weimar, 1974
 - 55A. Lefèvre, E. (ed.) *Monumentum Chiloniense. Studien zur augusteischen Zeit* (Festschr. Burck). Amsterdam, 1975
 56. Lloyd, G. E. R. *Greek Science after Aristotle*. New York-London, 1973
 57. Luttwak, E. *The Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire*. Baltimore, 1976
 58. Martino, F. de. *Storia della costituzione romana* IV, 1. Naples, 1974
 59. Millar, F. *The Emperor in the Roman World* (31 B.C.-A.D. 337). London, 1977
 60. Millar, F. 'The Mediterranean and the Roman revolution: politics, war and the economy', *P & P* 102 (1984) 3-24
 61. Millar, F. *The Roman Empire and its Neighbours*. 2nd edn. London, 1981
 62. *Misurare la terra. Centuriazione e coloni nel mondo romano. L'organizzazione del territorio in epoca romana*. Modena, 1983

63. Momigliano, A. D. *Alien Wisdom: the Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge, 1975
64. Momigliano, A. D. *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Storia e Letteratura 108/9). Rome, 1966
65. Mommsen, T. *Römisches Staatsrecht*. Vols. I and II 3rd edn, Leipzig, 1887; vol. III, Leipzig 1888
66. Nicolet, C. *Le métier de citoyen dans la Rome républicaine*. Paris, 1976; transl. as A 68
67. Nicolet, C. *Rome et la conquête du monde méditerranéen*. 2 vols. Paris, 1977; 2nd edn. 1 vol. Paris, 1979
68. Nicolet, C. *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*. London, 1980
69. Nicolet, C. *L'inventaire du monde. Géographie et politique aux origines de l'Empire romain*. Paris, 1988; transl. as A 70
70. Nicolet, C. *Space, Geography and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor, 1991
71. Nippel, W. *Aufbruch und 'Polizei' in der römischen Republik*. Stuttgart, 1988
72. Ogilvie, R. M. *Roman Literature and Society*. Brighton, 1980
73. Peters, F. E. *The Harvest of Hellenism*. London, 1972
- 73A. Pippidi, D. M. (ed.) *Assimilation et résistance à la culture gréco-romaine dans le monde ancien*. Bucharest-Paris, 1976
- 73B. 'Politics and art in Augustan literature', *Arethusa* 5.1 (1972)
74. Premerstein, A. von *Vom Werden und Wesen des Principats* (ABAW 15). Munich, 1937
75. *Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton, 1975
76. *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* I-IV edited by E. Groag and A. Stein; v edited by L. Petersen. Berlin-Leipzig, 1933-
77. Purcell, N. 'Maps, lists, money, order and power', *JRS* 80 (1990) 178-82
78. Quinn, K. 'Poet and audience', *ANRW* II, 30.1 (1982) 75-180
79. Rawson, E. D. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. London, 1985
80. Reinhold, M. *The Golden Age of Augustus*. Toronto, 1978
81. Rich, J. W. *Declaring War in the Roman Republic in the Period of Transmarine Expansion* (Coll. Latomus 149). Brussels, 1976
82. Ridley, R. T. 'Pompey's command in the 50s: how cumulative?', *RbM* 126 (1983) 136-48
- 82A. *La rivoluzione romana: inchiesta tra gli antichisti* (Biblioteca di Labeo 6). Naples, 1982
83. Rostovtzeff, M. I. *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. 2nd edn. 2 vols. Oxford, 1957
84. Rowell, H. T. *Rome in the Augustan Age*. Norman, OK, 1962
85. Rykwert, J. *The Idea of a Town. The Anthropology of Urban Form in Rome, Italy and the Ancient World*. Princeton, 1976
86. Sherk, R. K. *The Roman Empire: Augustus to Hadrian* (Translated Documents of Greece and Rome 6). Cambridge, 1988
87. Sherwin-White, A. N. *The Roman Citizenship*. 2nd edn. Oxford, 1973
88. Sherwin-White, A. N. 'The Lex Repetundarum and the political ideas of Gaius Gracchus', *JRS* 72 (1982) 18-31
89. Sherwin-White, A. N. *Roman Foreign Policy in the East*. London, 1984

90. Ste Croix, G. E. M. de *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World*. London, 1981
91. Stier, H. E. 'Augustusfriede und römische Klassik', *ANRW* II, 2 (1975) 3-54 (= *Kleine Schriften*, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 109, Meisenheim, 1979)
92. Sullivan, J. P. *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*. Ithaca, NY, 1985
93. Syme, R. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford, 1939
94. Syme, R. *Roman Papers*. 7 vols. Oxford, 1979-91 (I, II: 1979; III: 1984; IV, v: 1988; VI, VII: 1991)
95. Syme, R. *The Augustan Aristocracy*. Oxford, 1986
- 95A. *Thought* 55.216 (1980). (Roman Empire anniversary issue)
96. L'Urbs. *Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C.-IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)* Collection de l'école française de Rome 98). Rome, 1987
97. Versnel, H. *Triumphus*. Leiden, 1970
98. Veyne, P. *Le pain et le cirque*. Paris, 1976
99. *Villes et campagnes de l'Empire romain, Actes du colloque d'Aix-en-Provence 1980*. Aix, 1982
100. Wallace-Hadrill, A. 'The emperor and his virtues', *Hist.* 30 (1981) 298-323
101. Wells, C. M. *The Roman Empire*. London, 1984
102. Wickert, L. 'Neue Forschungen zum römischen Prinzipat', *ANRW* II, 1 (1974) 3-76 (with bibliography, 5-8)
103. Williams, G. W. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford, 1968
104. Williams, G. W. *Change and Decline in Roman Poetry* (Sather Classical Lectures 45). Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1978
105. Williams, G. W. *Figures and Thought in Roman Poetry*. New Haven, 1980
106. Wilson, A. J. N. *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome*. Manchester-New York, 1966
107. Wirszubski, C. *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate*. Cambridge, 1950
- 107A. Wirth, G. (ed.) *Romanitas-Christianitas. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Literatur der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Festschr. Straub). Berlin, 1982
108. Wiseman, T. P. (ed.) *Roman Political Life 90 B.C.-A.D. 69*. Exeter, 1985
109. Wiseman, T. P. *Roman Studies Literary and Historical*. Liverpool, 1987
110. Yavetz, Z. *Plebs and Princeps*. Oxford, 1969; 2nd edn. New Brunswick, NJ, 1988
111. Yuge, T. and Doi, M. (eds.) *Forms of Control and Subordination in Antiquity*. Leiden, 1988

B. SOURCES

I. WORKS ON ANCIENT AUTHORS

1. *Acta diui Augusti* 1 (only this volume published), edited by S. Riccobono et al. Rome, 1945
2. Albrecht, M. von 'Properz als augusteischer Dichter', *WS* 16 (1982) 220-36

3. Ambrose, J. W. 'Horace on foreign policy. Odes 4.4', *CJ* 69 (1973/4) 26-33
4. Anderson, R. D., Parsons, P. J. and Nisbet, R. G. M. 'Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrīm', *JRS* 69 (1979) 125-55
5. André J. *La vie et l'œuvre d'Asinius Pollion*. Paris, 1949
6. Anna, G. d'. 'Cornelio Gallo, Virgilio e Properzio', *Athenaeum* 59 (1981) 284-98
7. Armstrong, D. 'Horatius eques et scriba: Satires 1.6 and 2.7', *TAPA* 116 (1986) 255-88
8. Badian, E. 'Nobiles amici: art and literature in an aristocratic society', *CP* 80 (1985) 341-57
9. Baldwin, B. *Suetonius*. Amsterdam, 1983
10. Ball, R. J. 'The politics of Tibullus: Augustus, Messalla, and Macer', *GB* 10 (1981) 135-42
11. Balsdon, J. P. V. D. 'Dionysius on Romulus: a political pamphlet?', *JRS* 61 (1971) 18-27
12. Beaujeu, J. 'Le frère de Quirinus (à propos de Virgile, *Enéide* 1 292 et de Properce iv 1, 9)', *Mélanges Boyancé*, 57-72. Rome, 1974
13. Bellemore, J. *Nicolaus of Damascus, Life of Augustus*. Bristol, 1984
14. Bilde, P. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome. His Life, his Works, and their Importance*. Sheffield, 1988
15. Bowersock, G. W. 'Historical problems in late Republican and Augustan classicism', *Le classicisme à Rome* (Entretiens Hardt 25) 57-78. Vandoeuvres, 1978
16. Bowersock, G. W. 'The addressee of the eighth eclogue. A response', *HSCP* 82 (1978) 201-2
17. Brink, C. O. *Horace on Poetry* III. Cambridge, 1982
18. Broshi, M. 'The credibility of Josephus', *JJS* 33 (1982) 379-84
19. Brunt, P. A. 'Marcus Aurelius in his Meditations', *JRS* 64 (1974) 1-20
20. Bultmann, R. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. 2nd edn. London, 1972
21. Burck, E. 'Die Rolle des Dichters und der Gesellschaft in der augusteischen Dichtung', *A & A* 21 (1975) 12-35
22. Cairns, F. 'Propertius on Augustus' marriage law (II, 7)', *GB* 8 (1979) 185-204
23. Cairns, F. 'Propertius and the battle of Actium (4.6)', in B 204, 129-68
24. Carter, J. M. (ed.) *Suetonius, Divus Augustus*. Bristol, 1982
25. Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1913
26. Charlesworth, J. H. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. London, 1983-5
27. Chilver, G. E. F. *A Historical Commentary on Tacitus' Histories*, 1 and 2. Oxford, 1979; 4 and 5, edited by G. B. Townend. Oxford, 1985
28. Christ, K. 'Tacitus und der Prinzipat', *Hist.* 27 (1978) 449-87
29. Claassen, J. M. 'Error and the imperial household; an angry god and the exiled poet's fate', *AClass* 30 (1987) 31-47
30. Coffey, M. *Roman Satire*, 2nd edn. Bristol, 1989
31. Cohen, S. J. D. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: his Vita and Development as a Historian*. Leiden, 1979

32. Curran, L. C. 'Transformation and anti-Augustanism in Ovid's "Metamorphoses"', *Arethusa* 5.1 (1972) 71-91
33. Daly, L. J. 'Livius's veritas and the spolia opima. Politics and the heroics of A. Cornelius Cossus', *AntW* 4 (1981) 49-63
34. Deininger, J. 'Livius und der Prinzipat', in *AS4A*, 265-72
35. Desch, W. 'Horazens Beziehung zu Maecenas', *Eranos* 79 (1981) 33-45
36. Dobesch, G. 'Nikolaos von Damaskus und die Selbstbiographie des Augustus', *GB* 7 (1978) 91-174
37. Du Quesnay, I. M. le M. 'Virgil's first eclogue', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3 (1981) 29-182
38. Duckworth, H. T. F. *A Commentary on the Fifty Third Book of Cassius Dio's Roman History* (University of Toronto Studies, Philological Series 4). Toronto, 1916
39. Duret, L. 'Dans l'ombre des plus grands: I. Poètes et prosateurs mal connus de l'époque augustéenne', *ANRW* II, 30. 3 (1983) 1447-560
40. Eisenhut, W. 'Deus Caesar. Augustus in den Gedichten des Properz', in *A* 107A, 98-108
41. Elia, S. d'. 'L'esilio di Ovidio e alcuni aspetti della storia Augustea', *AFLN* 5 (1955) 95-157
42. Fadinger, V. *Die Begründung des Prinzipats. Quellenkritische und staatsrechtliche Untersuchungen zu Cassius Dio und der Parallelüberlieferung*. Berlin, 1969
43. Fairweather, J. 'Ovid's autobiographical poem, *Tristia* 4.10', *CQ* 37 (1987) 181-96
44. Fantham, R. E. 'Ovid, Germanicus, and the composition of the *Fasti*', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5 (1985) 243-81
45. Farron, S. 'Aen. VI 826-35 (the vision of Julius Caesar and Pompey) as an attack on Augustan propaganda', *AClass* 23 (1980) 53-68
46. Farron, S. 'The Aeneas-Dido episode as an attack on Aeneas' mission and Rome', *G & R* 27 (1980) 34-47
47. Farron, S. 'Aeneas' revenge for Pallas as a criticism of Aeneas', *AClass* 29 (1986) 69-93
48. Feldman, L. H. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship, 1937-1980*. Berlin, 1984
49. Feldman, L. H. 'Flavius Josephus revisited: the man, his writings, and his significance', *ANRW* II, 21.2 (1984) 763-862
50. Feldman, L. H. *Josephus: a Supplementary Bibliography*. New York, 1986
51. Fitton-Brown, A. D. 'The unreality of Ovid's Tomitan exile', *LCM* 10 (1985) 18-22
52. Fornaro, P. *Flavio Giuseppe, Tacito et l'Impero*. Turin, 1980
53. Fraenkel, E. *Horace*. Oxford, 1957
54. Gabba, E. 'Progetti di riforme economiche e fiscali in uno storico dell'età dei Severi', *Studi Fanfani* 1, 39-68. Milan, 1962
55. Gabba, E. *Appiani Bellorum Civilium Liber Quintus*. Florence, 1970
56. Gabba, E. 'La "Storia di Roma arcaica" di Dionigi d'Alicarnasso', *ANRW* II, 30.1 (1982) 799-816
57. Gabba, E. 'Political and cultural aspects of the classical revival in the Augustan age', *ClAnt* 1 (1982) 43-65

58. Galinsky, G. K. 'Some aspects of Ovid's golden age', *GB* 10 (1981) 193-205
59. Gasco, J. *Suetone historien*. Rome, 1984
60. Getty, R. J. 'Romulus, Roma, and Augustus in the sixth book of the *Aeneid*', *CPh* 45 (1950) 1-12
61. Ginsburg, J. *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus*. Salem, NH, 1981
62. Goodyear, F. R. D. *The Annals of Tacitus I (Annals 1, 1-54)*. Cambridge, 1972; II (1, 55-11). Cambridge, 1981
63. Goold, G. P. 'The cause of Ovid's exile', *ICS* 8 (1983) 94-107
64. Gosling, A. 'Tibullus 2.5 and Augustan propaganda', *EMC* 31 (1987) 333-9
65. Gow, A. S. F. and Page, D. L. *The Garland of Philip*. Cambridge, 1968
66. Grant, R. M. *Eusebius as Church Historian*. Oxford, 1980
67. Green, P. 'Carmen et error. Πρόφασις and αἰτία in the matter of Ovid's exile', *ClAnt* 1 (1982) 202-20
68. Griffin, J. 'Augustan poetry and the life of luxury', *JRS* 66 (1976) 87-105
69. Griffin, J. 'Propertius and Antony', *JRS* 67 (1977) 17-26
70. Griffin, J. 'The fourth Georgic, Virgil and Rome', *G & R* 26 (1979) 61-80
71. Griffin, M. *Seneca. A Philosopher in Politics*. Oxford, 1976
72. Grimal, P. 'Poésie et "propagande" au temps d'Auguste', *CHM* 8 (1964) 54-75
73. Grimal, P. 'Jupiter, Anchise et Vulcain: trois révélations sur le destin de Rome', in Diggle, J., Hall, J. B. and Jocelyn, H. D. (eds.) *Studies in Latin Literature ... in Honour of C. O. Brink* (Camb. Phil. Soc. Suppl. Vol. 15), 1-14. Cambridge, 1989
74. Hahn, H. 'Untersuchungen zur Autobiographie des Kaisers Augustus'. Diss., Leipzig, 1957
75. Hahn, H. 'Neue Untersuchungen zur Autobiographie des Kaisers Augustus', *La Nouvelle Clio* 10 (1958-60) 137-48
76. Hanslik, R. 'Die Augustusvita Suetons', *WS* 67 (1954) 99-144
77. Harrison, S. J. 'Augustus, the poets, and the *spolia opima*', *CQ* 39 (1989) 408-14
78. Harvey, F. D. '"Cognati Caesaris": Ovid *Amores* 1.2, 51-2', *WS* 17 (1983) 89-90
79. Hellegouarc'h, J. 'Les buts de l'œuvre historique de Velleius Paterculus', *Latomus* 23 (1964) 669-84
80. Hemer, C. J. *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia in their Local Setting*. Sheffield, 1986
81. Hemer, C. J. *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*. Tübingen, 1989
82. Hermes, J. C. 'Cornelius Gallus und Vergil. Das Problem der Umarbeitung des vierten Georgica-Buches'. Diss., Münster, 1977
83. Herter, H. 'Das Concilium Deorum im 1. Metamorphosenbuch Ovids', in A 107A, 109-24
84. Heubner, H. P. *Cornelius Tacitus: die Historien*. 5 vols. Heidelberg, 1963-82

- 84A. Highet, G. *Juvenal the Satirist*. Oxford, 1954
85. Holleman, A. W. J. 'Ovid and politics', *Hist.* 20 (1971) 458-66
86. Hollis, A. S. *Ovid, Ars Amatoria, Book 1*. Oxford, 1977
87. Horsfall, N. 'Maecenas, Horace and the Georgics once more', *Macquarie Ancient Hist. Association* 3, 1981
88. Horsfall, N. *Cornelius Nepos. A Selection, Including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*. Oxford, 1989
89. Horsfall, N. 'Virgil and Marcellus' education', *CQ* 39 (1989) 266-7
- 89A. Hubbard, M. *Propertius*. London, 1974
90. Hurst, A. 'Un critique grec dans la Rome d'Auguste: Denys d'Halicarnasse', *ANRW* II, 30.1 (1982) 839-65
91. Janssen, O. 'De verbanning van Ovidius: waarheid of fictie?', *Coll. Francisc. Neerlandica* 5.3 (1981) no. 3, 77-105
92. Jeffreys, E., Jeffreys, M. and Scott, R. *The Chronicle of John Malalas. A Translation*. Melbourne, 1986
93. Johnson, W. R. 'The emotions of patriotism: Propertius, 4.6', *CSCA* 6 (1973) 151-80
94. Jones, C. P. *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford, 1971
95. Kenney, E. J. and Clausen, W. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, 11: *Latin Literature*. Cambridge, 1982
96. Koester, H. *Introduction to the New Testament*. 2 vols. Berlin, 1982
97. Koester, H. *Ancient Christian Gospels: their History and Development*. London, 1990
98. Koestermann, E. *Cornelius Tacitus: Annalen*. 4 vols. Heidelberg, 1963-8
99. Korfmacher, W. C. 'Vergil, spokesman for the Augustan reforms', *CJ* 51 (1955/6) 329-34
100. Kragerrud, S. 'Perusia and the Aeneid', *SymbOsl* 62 (1987) 77-87
101. Kühnert, F. 'Augusteische Dichtung und Dichtung der augusteischen Zeit', in A 54A, 118-29
102. La Penna, A. *Orazio e l'ideologia del Principato*. Turin, 1963
103. Lambrecht, U. *Herrscherbild und Prinzipatsidee in Suetons Kaiserbiographien. Untersuchungen zur Caesar- und zur Augustusvita*. Bonn, 1984
104. Lana, I. *Velleio Patercolo o della propaganda*. Turin, 1952
105. Lasserre, F. 'Strabon devant l'empire romain', *ANRW* II, 30.1 (1982) 867-96
106. Leach, E. W. 'Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* and *De Clementia*', *Arethusa* 22 (1989) 197-230
107. Lefèvre, E. 'Horaz und Maecenas', *ANRW* II, 31.3 (1981) 1987-2029
108. Lefèvre, E. 'Die laudes Galli in Vergils Georgica', *WS* 20 (1986) 183-92
109. Lenel, O. *Palingenesia Iuris Civilis*. Leipzig, 1889; repr. 1960
110. Lenel, O. *Das Edictum Perpetuum*. 3rd edn. Leipzig, 1927; repr. 1974
111. Little, D. 'Politics in Augustan poetry', *ANRW* II, 30.1 (1982) 254-370
112. Lüdemann, G. *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: a Commentary*. Minneapolis, 1989
113. Lundström, S. *Ovids Metamorphosen und die Politik des Kaisers* (Stud. Lat. Upsal. 12). Stockholm, 1980
114. Lyne, R. O. A. M. 'Virgil and the politics of war', *CQ* 33 (1983) 188-203

115. Mack, B. L. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia, 1988
116. McKechnie, P. 'Cassius Dio's speech of Agrippa. A realistic alternative to imperial government?', *G & R* 28 (1981) 150-5
117. McKeown, J. C. 'Fabula proposita nulla tegenda meo: Ovid's *Fasti* and Augustan politics', in B 204, 169-87
118. Malcovati, E. (ed.) *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti operum fragmenta*. 5th edn. Turin, 1969
119. Malcovati, E. 'Augusto fonte di Svetonio', *WS Beiheft* 8 (Festschr. R. Hanslik), 187-95. Vienna, 1977
120. Malherbe, A. J. *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis, 1989
121. Manuwald, B. *Cassius Dio und Augustus*. Wiesbaden, 1979
122. Mehl, A. 'Bemerkungen zu Dios und Tacitus' Arbeitsweise und zur Quellenlage im "Totengericht" über Augustus', *Gymn.* 88 (1981) 54-64
123. Mehl, H. *Tacitus über Kaiser Claudius*. Munich, 1974
124. Mendelson, A. *Philo's Jewish Identity*. Atlanta, 1988
125. Mensching, E. 'Livius, Cossus und Augustus', *MH* 24 (1967) 12-32
126. Merkelbach, R. 'Augustus und Romulus (Erklärung von Horaz, *Carm.* I 12, 37-40)', *Philologus* 104 (1960) 149-53
127. Mette, H. J. 'Livius und Augustus', *Gymn.* 68 (1961) 269-85
128. Millar, F. *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford, 1964
129. Moehring, H. R. 'Joseph ben Matthia and Flavius Josephus: the Jewish prophet and Roman historian', *ANRW* II, 21.2 (1984) 864-944
130. Nagle, B. R. *The Poetics of Exile. Program and Polemic in the Tristia and Epistulae ex Ponto of Ovid* (Coll. Latomus 170). Brussels, 1980
131. Nikiprowetzky, V. *La troisième Sibylle*. Paris, 1970
132. Nisbet, R. G. M. 'Horace's *Epodes* and History', in B 204, 1-20
133. Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. *Horace, Odes Book I*. Oxford, 1970; *Book II*. Oxford, 1978
134. Norberg, D. 'La divinité d'Auguste dans la poésie d'Horace', *Erano* 44 (1946) 389-403
135. Ogilvie, R. M. *A Commentary on Livy 1-5*. Oxford, 1965
- 135A. Otis, B. *Virgil: a Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford, 1963
136. Paladini, M. L. 'A proposito della tradizione poetica sulla battaglia di Azio', *Latomus* 17 (1958) 240-69, 462-75
137. Paratore, E. 'Letteratura pagana nella Gallia romana', *Atti del colloquio sul tema La Gallia romana (1971)*, 53-86. Rome, 1973
138. Pelling, C. B. R. *Plutarch, Life of Antony*. Cambridge, 1988
139. Petersman, G. 'Cornelius Gallus und der Papyrus von Qaşr Ibrim', *ANRW* II, 30 (1983) 1649-55
140. Phillips, C. R. 'Rethinking Augustan poetry', *Latomus* 42 (1983) 780-818
141. Poma, G. 'Provvedimenti augustei su debiti e schiavi nell'interpretazione di Orosio', *RSÄ* 16 (1986) 155-64
142. Pöschl, V. *Horaz und die Politik* (SB Heidelberg 1956.4) (= *Kleine Schriften* I, 145-77. Heidelberg, 1979)
143. Pöschl, V. 'Virgil und Augustus', *ANRW* II, 31.2 (1981) 707-27
144. Putnam, M. C. J. 'The Virgilian achievement', *Arethusa* 5.1 (1972) 53-70

145. Quinn, K. 'The poet and his audience in the Augustan age', *ANRW* II, 30.1 (1982) 75-180
146. Rahn, H. 'Zum Carmen saeculare des Horaz', *Gymn.* 77 (1970) 467-79
147. Rajak, T. *Josephus: the Historian and his Society*. London, 1983
148. Reckford, K. J. 'Horace and Maecenas', *TAPA* 90 (1959) 195-208
149. Reinhold, M. 'The unhero Aeneas', *C & M* 27 (1966) 195-207
150. Reinhold, M. *From Republic to Principate: an Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio Books 49-52 (36-29 B.C.)* (American Philological Association Monographs 34). Atlanta, 1988
151. Ritter, H. W. 'Cluvius Rufus bei Josephus?', *RbM* 115 (1972) 85-91
152. Roddaz, J. M. 'De César à Auguste: l'image de la monarchie chez un historien du siècle des Sévères. Réflexions sur l'œuvre de Dion Cassius, à propos d'ouvrages récents', *REA* 85 (1983) 67-87
153. Rostagni, A. (ed.) *Svetonio 'de poetis' e biografi minori*. Turin, 1956
154. Rudd, W. J. N. 'Ovid and the Augustus myth', in *id. Lines of Enquiry*, 1-31. Cambridge, 1976
155. Rudd, W. J. N. 'The idea of empire in the Aeneid', *Hermathena* 134 (1983) 35-50
156. Saller, R. P. 'Anecdotes as evidence for Roman imperial history', *G & R* ser. 2, 27 (1980) 69-83
157. Sanders, E. P. and Davies, M. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London, 1989
- 157A. Santirocco, M. *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*. Chapel Hill, 1986
158. Scardigli, B. and Delbianco, P. *Nicolaos di Damasco, Vita di Augusto*. Florence, 1983
159. Schäfer, P. 'New Testament and hekhalot literature', *JJS* 38 (1984) 19-35
160. Schalit, A. *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden, 1968
161. Schultze, C. 'Dionysius of Halicarnassos and his audience', in Moxon, I. S., Smart, J. D. and Woodman, A. J. (eds.) *Past Perspectives*, 121-41. Cambridge, 1986
162. Schwartz, D. R. 'Josephus and Nicolaus on the Pharisees', *JSJ* 14 (1983) 157-71
163. Scott-Kilvert, I. (transl.). *Cassius Dio. The Roman History: the Reign of Augustus*. Harmondsworth, 1987
164. Stahl, H. P. *Propertius: 'Love' and 'War'. Individual and State under Augustus*. Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1985
165. Stambaugh, J. E. and Balch, D. L. *The New Testament in its Social Environment*. Philadelphia, 1986
166. Starr, C. G. 'Horace and Augustus', *AJPh* 90 (1969) 58-64 (= *Essays on Ancient History*, 241-7. Leiden, 1979)
167. Steidle, W. 'Beobachtungen zum Geschichtswerk des Cassius Dio', *WJA* 14 (1988) 203-24
168. Stern, M. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. 3 vols. Jerusalem, 1974-84
169. Stone, M. E. (ed.) *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Sect. II). Assen, 1984

170. Strack, H. L. and Stemberger, G. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (transl. by M. Bockmuehl). Edinburgh, 1991
171. Stroh, W. 'Tröstende Musen: zur literarhistorischen Stellung und Bedeutung von Ovids Exilgedichten', *ANRW* II, 31.4 (1981) 2638-84
172. Strzelecki, W. C. *Atei Capitonis Fragmenta*. Leipzig, 1967
173. Sullivan, J. 'The politics of elegy', *Arethusa* 5.1 (1972) 17-34
174. Sumner, G. V. 'The truth about Velleius Paterculus: Prolegomena', *HSCP* 74 (1970) 257-97
175. Swan, P. M. 'Cassius Dio on Augustus: a poverty of annalistic sources?', *Phoenix* 41 (1987) 272-91
176. Syme, R. *Tacitus*. Oxford, 1958
177. Syme, R. 'Livy and Augustus', *HSCP* 64 (1959), 27-87 (=A 94, I, 400-54)
178. Syme, R. *Ten Studies in Tacitus*. Oxford, 1970
179. Syme, R. *History in Ovid*. Oxford, 1978
180. Syme, R. 'Janus and Parthia in Horace', in Diggle, J., Hall, J. B. and Jocelyn, H. D. (eds.) *Studies in Latin Literature . . . in Honour of C. O. Brink*. (Camb. Phil. Soc. Suppl. Vol. 15), 113-24. Cambridge, 1989 (=A 94, VI, 441-50)
181. Tarrant, R. J. 'The addressee of Virgil's eighth eclogue', *HSCP* 82 (1978) 197-9
182. Thollard, P. 'La notion de civilisation dans les livres III et IV de Strabon', *Annales littéraires de la Faculté de Besançon* (1987)
183. Thorley, J. 'The nativity-census. What does Luke actually say?', *G & R* 26 (1979) 81-4
184. Toher, M. 'The date of Nicolaus' βίος Καίσαρος', *GRBS* 26 (1985) 199-206
185. Torelli, M. 'Contributi al Supplemento del *CIL* IX', *RAL* 8, 24 (1969) 9-48
186. Traill, D. A. 'Horace C. 13. A political ode?', *CJ* 78 (1982/3) 131-7
187. Voit, L. 'Horaz-Merkur-Augustus (zu Horaz, C. II 17, I 10, I 2)', *Gymn.* 89 (1982) 479-96
188. Wacholder, B. Z. *Nicolaus of Damascus*. Berkeley, 1962
189. Wagenvoort, H. 'The crime of fratricide (Horace *Epode* 7, 18)', in Wagenvoort, H. (ed.) *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*, 169-83. Leiden, 1956
190. Wallace-Hadrill, A. *Suetonius: the Scholar and his Caesars*. London, 1983
191. Wallace-Hadrill, A. 'Time for Augustus: Ovid, Augustus, and the *Fasti*?', in Whitby, L. M., Hardie, P. R. and Whitby, M. (eds.) *Homo Viator* (Classical Essays for John Bramble), 221-30. Bristol-Oak Park, IL, 1987
- 191A. Walsh, P. G. *Livy* (New Surveys in the Classics 8). Oxford, 1974
192. Watson, L. 'Epode 9, or The Art of Falsehood', in Whitby, L. M., Hardie, P. and Whitby, M. (eds.) *Homo Viator* (Classical Essays for John Bramble), 119-30. Bristol-Oak Park, IL, 1987
193. Wellesley, K. *Cornelius Tacitus: the Histories, Book III*. Sydney, 1972
194. Wickert, L. 'Horaz und Augustus', *WJA* 2 (1947) 158-72
195. Wiedemann, T. 'The political background to Ovid's *Tristia* II', *CQ* 25 (1975) 264-71

196. Williams, G. 'Horace Odes 1 12 and the succession to Augustus', *Hermathena* 118 (1974) 147-55
197. Williams, G. *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*. New Haven-London, 1983
- 197A. Wiseman, T. P. *Cinna the Poet and other Roman Essays*. Leicester, 1974
198. Wiseman, T. P. 'Calpurnius Siculus and the Claudian civil war', *JRS* 72 (1982) 57-67 (= A 109, 86-96)
199. Wiseman, T. P. 'Cybele, Virgil and Augustus', in B 204, 117-28
200. Wistrand, E. *Horace's Ninth Epode and its Historical Background*. Göteborg, 1958
201. Witke, C. *Horace's Roman Odes. A Critical Examination* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 77). Leiden, 1983
202. Woodman, A. J. *Velleius Paterculus: the Tiberian Narrative*. Cambridge, 1977
203. Woodman, A. J. *Velleius Paterculus: the Caesarian and Augustan Narrative*. Cambridge, 1983
204. Woodman, A. J. and West, D. (eds.) *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge, 1984
205. Zecchini, G. *Il carmen de bello actiaco. Storiografia e lotta politica in età augustea* (*Historia Einzelschr.* 51). Stuttgart, 1987

2. EPIGRAPHY

206. Arangio-Ruiz, V. 'Testi e Documenti VI, L'iscrizione leidense di Augusto', *BIDR* 64 (1961) 323-42
207. Atkinson, K. M. T. 'Restitutio in integrum and iussum Augusti Caesaris in an inscription at Leyden', *RIDA* 7 (1960) 228-72
208. Badian, E. 'Notes on some documents from Aphrodisias concerning Octavian', *GRBS* 25 (1984) 157-70
209. Balland, A. 'Q. Veranius cos. ord. 49 et sa famille', *Fouilles de Xanthos VII* (*Inst. français d'études anatoliennes*) 79-102. Paris, 1981
210. Bivona, L. *Iscrizioni latine lapidarie del Museo di Palermo*. Palermo, 1970
211. Bogaers, J. E. 'King Cogidubnus: another reading of RIB 91', *Britannia* 10 (1979) 243-54
212. Bove, L. *Documenti processuali dalle tabulae Pompeianae di Murecine*. Naples, 1979
213. Bove, L. *Documenti di operazioni finanziarie dall'archivio dei Sulpici*. Naples, 1984
214. Brunt, P. A. 'C. Fabricius Tuscus and an Augustan dilectus', *ZPE* 13 (1974) 161-85
215. Brunt, P. A. and Moore, J. M. (eds.) *Res Gestae divi Augusti: the Achievements of the Divine Augustus*. Oxford, 1967
216. Carter, J. M. 'A new fragment of Octavian's inscription at Nicopolis', *ZPE* 24 (1977) 227-30
217. Cavallaro, M. A. 'Economia e religio nei ludi secolari augustei. Per una nuova interpretazione di *CIL* VI 32324; 32323, 59', *RhM* 122 (1979) 49-87
218. Coli, U. 'Nuove osservazioni e congetture sulla Tabula Hebana', *Iura* 3 (1952) 90-131

219. Collingwood, R. G. and Wright, R. P. *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain*. 1: *Inscriptions on Stone*. Oxford, 1965. 11: *Instrumentum Domesticum*. Fasc. 1. Gloucester, 1990
220. Crook, J. A. 'An Augustan inscription in the Rijksmuseum at Leyden, *SEG* xviii 555', *PCPhS* 8 (1962) 23-9
221. D'Agata, A. R. M. *Decreta Pisana*, *CIL* xi, 1420-21. Pisa, 1980
222. D'Ors, A. *Epigrafía jurídica de la España romana*. Madrid, 1953
223. Degrassi, A. 'Frammenti di elogi e di una dedica a Romolo del Foro d'Augusto', *BCAR* 67 (1939) 5-12
224. Degrassi, A. (ed.) *Inscriptiones Italiae* xiii. Rome, 1947 and 1963
225. Degrassi, A. 'Il sepolcro dei Salvii a Ferento e le sue iscrizioni', *RPAA* 34 (1961-2) 59-77 (= *Scritti vari di antichità* III, 155-72. Venice-Trieste, 1967)
226. Degrassi, A. 'Epigraphica II', *Memorie dell' Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, Classe de Sc. mor., stor. e filol., 8th ser., 11 (1965) 233-47 (= *Scritti vari di antichità* III, 35-87. Venice-Trieste, 1967)
227. Ehrenberg, V. and Jones, A. H. M. *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*. 2nd edn. Oxford, 1955; repr. with Addenda, 1976 and 1979
228. Engelmann, H. and Knibbe, D. 'Das Monumentum Ephesenum. Ein Vorbericht', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 8 (1986) 19-32
229. Engelmann, H. and Knibbe, D. 'Das Zollgesetz der Provinz Asia', *Epigraphica Anatolica* 14 (1989) 1-206
230. Frey, J. B. *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum*. 2 vols. Vol. 1, 2nd edn with prolegomenon by B. Lifshitz, New York, 1975; vol. II, Rome, 1952
231. Frisch, P. 'Zu den Elogien des Augustusforums', *ZPE* 39 (1980) 91-8
232. Frova, A. 'L'iscrizione di Pontio Pilato a Cesarea', *RIL* 95 (1961) 419-34
233. Gagé, J. (ed.) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. 3rd edn. Paris, 1977
234. González, J. 'Tabula Siarensis, Fortunales Siarenses et Municipia Civium Romanorum', *ZPE* 55 (1984) 55-100
235. González, J. 'The Lex Irnitana: a new copy of the Flavian municipal law', *JRS* 76 (1986) 147-243
236. Gordon, A. E. 'Notes on the Res Gestae of Augustus', *CSCA* 1 (1968) 125-38
237. Griffin, M. T. 'The Lyons tablet and Tacitean hindsight', *CQ* 32 (1982) 404-18
238. Guarducci, M. 'Ancora una volta sul frammento dell' *Edictum de pretiis* di Diocleziano trovato a Pettorano sul Gizio', *Athenaeum* 63 (1985) 491-4
239. Habicht, C. 'New evidence on the province of Asia', *JRS* 65 (1975) 64-91
240. Hall, A. 'New light' on the capture of Isaura Vetus', *Akten des VI internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik* (Vestigia 17), 568-71. Munich, 1972
241. Hartmann, E. 'Die Gallus-Inschrift auf dem Vatikanischen Obelisk', *Gymn.* 72 (1965) 1-8
242. Henzen, W. *Acta fratrum Arvalium quae supersunt*. Berlin, 1874
243. Hoffmann, W. 'Der Widerstreit von Tradition und Gegenwart im Tatenbericht des Augustus', *Gymn.* 76 (1969) 17-33

244. Kroemer, D. 'Textkritisches zu Augustus und Tiberius (Res gestae c. 34–Tac. Ann. 6, 30, 3)', *ZPE* 28 (1978) 127–44
245. Kunkel, W. 'Über die Leidener Augustus-Inschrift aus Kyme', *Studi Betti* 11, 591–620. Milan, 1962
246. Laffi, U. 'Le iscrizioni relative all'introduzione nel 9 a.C. del nuovo calendario della Provincia d'Asia', *SCO* 16 (1967) 5–98
247. Lauffer, S. 'Annos undeiginti natus', *Historia Einzelschr.* 40 (Studies H. Bengtson), 174–7. Wiesbaden, 1983
248. Lesuisse, L. 'La clause transitoire de la lex de imperio Vespasiani', *RBPb* 40 (1962) 51–75
249. Levi, M. A. 'La composizione delle Res gestae diui Augusti', *RFIC* (1947) 189–210
250. Lüderitz, G. (ed.) *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaica*. Wiesbaden, 1983
251. McCrum, M. and Woodhead, A. G. *Select Documents of the Principates of the Flavian Emperors A.D. 68–96*. Cambridge, 1961
252. Manni Piraino, M. T. *Iscrizioni greche lapidarie del museo di Palermo*. Palermo, 1973
253. Millar, F. 'Imperial ideology in the Tabula Siarensis', in González, J. and Arce, J. (eds.) *Estudios sobre la Tabula Siarensis*, 11–19. Madrid, 1988
254. Michelsen, E. 'The palaeographical interference as reflected in the Latin inscriptions of Clusium and Perusia', in Bruun, P. *et al.* *Studies in the Romanisation of Etruria*, 247–67. Rome, 1975
255. Mitchell, S. 'Requisitioned transport in the Roman empire: a new inscription from Pisidia', *JRS* 66 (1976) 106–31
256. Moretti, L. 'Frammenti vecchi e nuovi del Commentario dei Ludi secolari', *RPAA* 55–6 (1982–4) 361–79
257. Mourgues, J.-L. 'The so-called letter of Domitian at the end of the Lex Irnitana', *JRS* 77 (1987) 78–87
258. Oliver, J. H. 'The main problem of the Augustan inscription from Cyme', *GRBS* 4 (1963) 115–22
259. Oliver, J. H. 'Octavian's inscription at Nicopolis', *AJPh* 90 (1969) 178–82
260. Paci, G. 'Possibili tracce di statuti municipali in alcune iscrizioni d'Italia concernenti un particolare tipo di munificenza privata', in *Epigrafia Juridica Romana*, 125–33. Pamplona, 1989
261. Pearse, J. L. D. 'Three alba of the Collegium Fabrum Tignariorum of Rome', *BCAR* 85 (1976–7) 163–76
262. Pekáry, T. 'Statuae meae . . . argenteae steterunt in urbe xxx circiter, quas ipse iustuli. Interpretationen zu Res gestae diui Augusti 24', in *Λ* 55A, 96–108
263. Pigghi, J. B. *De ludis saecularibus . . . libri sex*. 2nd edn. Amsterdam, 1965
264. Pleket, H. W. *The Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leyden*. Leiden, 1958
265. Ramage, E. S. *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' 'Res Gestae'*. (*Historia Einzelschrift* 54). Wiesbaden, 1987

266. Ramage, E. S. 'The date of Augustus' Res Gestae', *Chiron* 18 (1988) 71-82
267. Rehm, A. in Kawerau, G. and Rehm, A. (eds.) *Das Delphinion in Milet, Milet* 1. 3. Berlin, 1914
268. Rengen, W. van 'L'épigraphie grecque et latine de Syrie. Bilan d'un quart de siècle de recherches épigraphiques', *ANRW* II, 8 (1978) 31-53
269. Rey-Coquais, J.-P. 'Inscriptions grecques d'Apamée', *AAS* 23 (1973) 39-84
270. Reynolds, J. *Aphrodisias and Rome* (JRS Monographs 1). London, 1982
271. Richardson, J. S. 'The Tabula Contrebiensis. Roman law in Spain in the early first century B.C.', *JRS* 73 (1983) 33-41
272. Ritter, H. W. 'Überlegungen zur Inschrift des Augustusbogens auf dem Forum Romanum', *MDAI(R)* 85 (1978) 371-84
273. Robert, J. and L. *Bulletin épigraphique* in *REG* (1934-84)
274. Robert, L. *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*. Paris, 1938
275. Robert, L. *Hellenica, recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, I-XIII. Limoges-Paris, 1940-65
276. Robert, L. 'Discussion of a place-name in the Leiden inscription', *REG* 86 (1973) 135-6
277. Roueché, C. 'Acclamations in the later Roman Empire: new evidence from Aphrodisias', *JRS* 74 (1984) 181-99
278. Salvaterra, C. 'Forum Iulium nell'iscrizione di C. Cornelius Gallus sull'obelisco Vaticano', *Aegyptus* 67 (1987) 171-81
279. Schachermeyr, F. and Merkelbach, R. *Inschriften griechischer Städten aus Kleinasien*. Bonn, 1972-
280. Seston, W. 'Le clipeus virtutis d'Arles et la composition des Res gestae divi Augusti', *CRAI* 1954, 286-97
281. Seyfarth, W. 'Potitus rerum omnium. Ein Beitrag zur Deutung der RGDA, Kapitel 34', *Philologus* 101 (1957) 305-23
282. Sherck, R. K. *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*. Baltimore, 1969
283. Sherck, R. K. *Rome and the Greek East* (Translated Documents of Greece and Rome, 4). Cambridge, 1984
284. Smallwood, E. M. *Documents Illustrating the Principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero*. Cambridge, 1967; Bristol, 1984
285. Solin, H. 'Ricerche epigrafiche in Ciociaria', *Epigraphica* 50 (1988) 87-104
286. Sotgiu, G. *Iscrizioni latine della Sardegna* I. Padua, 1961
287. Stiehl, R. *Die Datierung der Kapitولينischen Fasten*. Tübingen, 1957
288. Syme, R. 'Sejanus on the Aventine', *Hermes* 84 (1956) 257-66 (= *Λ* 94, I 305-14)
289. Taylor, L. R. 'The date of the Capitoline Fasti', *CPh* 41 (1946) 1-11
290. Taylor, L. R. 'New indications of Augustan editing in the Capitoline Fasti', *CPh* 46 (1951) 73-80
291. Torelli, M. *Elogia Tarquiniensia*. Florence, 1975
292. Vassileiou, H. 'Drusus imperator appellatus in Germania (Ergänzung des Drususelogiums auf dem Forum Augusti)', *ZPE* 51 (1983) 213-14

293. Visscher, F. de *Les édits d'Auguste découverts à Cyrène*. Louvain, 1940; repr. Osnabrück, 1965
294. Volkmann, H. 'Bemerkungen zu den Res gestae diui Augusti', *Hist.* 3 (1954) 81-6
295. Volkmann, H. 'Zur Gallus-Inschrift auf dem Vatikanischen Obelisken', *Gymn.* 72 (1965) 325-30 (= *id. Endoxos Duleia* (Berlin, 1975) 191-3)
296. Weber, E. 'Zur Inschrift des Pontius Pilatus', *BJ* 171 (1971) 194-200
297. Wigtil, D. N. 'The ideology of the Greek Res Gestae', *ANRW* II, 30.1 (1982) 624-38
298. Wigtil, D. N. 'The translator of the Greek Res Gestae of Augustus', *AJPh* 103 (1982) 189-94
299. Wuilleumier, P. *Inscriptions latines des Trois Gaules. Gallia*. Suppl. 17 (1984)
300. Yavetz, Z. 'The Res Gestae and Augustus' image', in C 176, 1-36
301. Zecchini, G. 'La Tabula Siarensis e la "Dissimulatio" di Tiberio', *ZPE* 66 (1986) 23-9

3. NUMISMATICS

302. Alföldi, M. R. *Die Fundmünzen der Römischen Zeit in Deutschland* IV.3/1. Berlin, 1970
303. Allen, D. 'The Belgic dynasties of Britain and their coins', *Archaeologia* 90 (1944) 1-46
304. Allen, D. 'A study of the Dobunnian coinage', in Clifford, E. M. (ed.) *Bagendon: a Belgic Oppidum*, 75-149. Cambridge, 1961
305. Allen, D. 'The origins of coinage in Britain: a reappraisal', in Frere, S. S. (ed.) *Problems of the Iron Age in Southern Britain*, 97-308. London, 1958
306. Aulock, H. von *Münzen und Städte Lykaoniens* (MDAI(I) 16). Tübingen, 1976
307. Aulock, H. von *Münzen und Städte Pisidiens 1 and 2* (MDAI(I) 19 and 22). Tübingen, 1977, 1979
308. Aulock, H. von. *Münzen und Städte Phrygiens 1* (MDAI(I) 25). Tübingen, 1980
309. Bay, A. 'The letters SC on Augustan aes coinage', *JRS* 62 (1972) 111-22
310. Belloni, G. G. 'Monete romane (repubblica e impero) in quanto opera d'artigianato e arte. Osservazioni e impostazione di problemi', *ANRW* II, 12. 3 (1985) 89-115
311. Burnett, A. 'Sicily', in B 312, 165-81
312. Burnett, A., Amandry, M. and Ripollès, P. P. *Roman Provincial Coinage. 1: From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 B.C.-A.D. 69)*. London-Paris, 1992
313. Burnett, A. M. 'The authority to coin in the late Republic and early Empire', *NC* 17 (1977) 37-63
314. Buttrey, T. V. 'Studies in the coinage of Marc Antony'. Diss., Princeton, 1953
315. Buttrey, T. V. 'Roman coinage of the Cyrenaica, first century B.C. to first century A.D.', in Brooke, C. N. L. (ed.) *Studies in Numismatic Method presented to Philip Grierson* 23-46. Cambridge, 1983

- 315A. Buttrey, T. V. 'Crete and Cyrene', in A. M. Burnett and M. H. Crawford (eds.), *The Coinage of the Roman World in the Late Republic* (BAR International Series 326), 165-74. Oxford, 1987
316. Carson, J. *Principal Coins of the Romans: II. The Principate 31 B.C.-A.D. 296*. London, 1980
- 316A. Chapman, A. E. 'Some first century B.C. bronze coins of Cnossos', *NC* 8 (1968) 13-26
317. Collis, J. R. 'Functional and theoretical interpretations of British coinage', *World Archaeology* 3 (1971) 71-84
318. Crawford, M. H. *Roman Republican Coin Hoards*. London, 1969
319. Crawford, M. H. *Roman Republican Coinage* 1-11. Cambridge, 1974
320. Crawford, M. H. *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic: Italy and the Mediterranean Economy*. London, 1985
321. Ercolani Cocchi, E. *Metodi di ricerca numismatica e problemi della prima monetazione imperiale*, 1: *Augusto* (Studi di storia antica 2). Bologna, 1978
322. Grant, M. *From Imperium to Auctoritas: a Historical Study of Aes Coinage in the Roman Empire 49 B.C.-A.D. 14*. Cambridge, 1946; repr. 1969
323. Grant, M. 'A step toward world-coinage, 19 B.C.', in P. R. Coleman-Norton (ed.) *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honour of A. C. Johnson*, 88-112. Princeton, 1951
324. Grant, M. *The Six Main Aes Coinages of Augustus. Controversial Studies*. Edinburgh, 1953
325. Howgego, C. J. *Greek Imperial Countermarks. Studies in the Provincial Coinage of the Roman Empire*. Roy. Num. Soc. Special Publ. 17. London, 1985
326. Imhoof-Blumer, F. *Kleinasiatische Münzen*. Sonderschr. des Öst. Arch. Inst. in Wien 1, III. Vienna, 1901-2
327. Jucker, A. 'Apollo Palatinus und Apollo Actius auf augusteischen Münzen', *MH* 39 (1982) 82-100
328. Kadman, L. *The Coins of the Jewish War of 66-73 C.E.* Tel Aviv, 1960
329. Kadman, L. *The Coins of Akko Ptolemais*. Jerusalem, 1961
330. Kent, J. P. C. *Roman Coins*. London, 1978
331. Kindler, A. *The Coinage of Bostra*. Warminster, 1983
332. Kraay, C. M. *The Aes Coinage of Galba*. New York, 1956
333. Kraft, K. 'Zur Datierung der römischen Münzmeisterprägung unter Augustus', *MZ* 46/47 (1951-2) 28-35 (= *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur antiken Geldgeschichte und Numismatik* 1 (Kleine Schriften II), 42-56. Darmstadt, 1978)
334. Kraft, K. 'S(enatus) C(onsulto)', *JNG* 12 (1962) 7-49. (Repr. in Schmitthenner, W. (ed.) *Augustus*, 336-403. Darmstadt, 1969) (= *Gesammelte Aufsätze* II (Kleine Schriften III), 143-210. Darmstadt, 1985)
335. Kraft, K. *Zur Münzprägung des Augustus* (SB Frankfurt 7, no. 5), Wiesbaden, 1969 (= *Gesammelte Aufsätze* 1 (Kleine Schriften II), 291-337. Darmstadt, 1978)
336. Kunisz, A. *Recherches sur le monnayage et la circulation monétaire sous le règne d'Auguste*. Warsaw, 1976

337. Levick, B. M. 'Mercy and moderation on the coinage of Tiberius', in Levick, B. M. (ed.) *The Ancient Historian and his Materials*, 123-38. Farnborough, 1976
338. Levick, B. M. 'Propaganda and the imperial coinage', *Antichthon* 16 (1982) 104-16
339. Liegle, J. 'Die Münzprägung Oktavians nach dem Sieg von Actium und die augusteische Kunst', *JDAI* 56 (1941) 91-119
340. *Masada I: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965. Final Reports. The Coins of Masada*, edited by Y. Meshorer. Jerusalem, 1989
341. Mattingly, H. and Carson, R. A. G. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*. 6 vols. London, 1932-62
342. Mattingly, H., Sydenham, E. A., Webb, P. H. et al. *The Roman Imperial Coinage* 1-v; vii; ix. London, 1923-66
343. Meshorer, Y. *Nabataean Coins*. Quedem 3. Jerusalem, 1975
344. Meshorer, Y. *Ancient Jewish Coinage*. 2 vols. New York, 1982
345. Mirnik, I. *Coin Hoards in Yugoslavia* (BAR International Series 95). Oxford, 1981
346. Newby, J. D. *A Numismatic Commentary on the Res Gestae of Augustus*. London, 1938
347. Panvini Rosati, F. 'Le emissioni in oro e argento dei "tresviri monetales" di Augusto', *ArchClass* 3 (1951) 66-85
- 347A. Robinson, E. S. G. *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Cyrenaica (in the British Museum)*. London, 1927
348. Rodewald, C. *Money in the Age of Tiberius*. Manchester, 1976
349. Scheer, R. 'Vindex libertatis', *Gymn.* 78 (1971) 182-8
350. Seyrig, H. 'Le monnayage de Ptolemais en Phénice', *RN* n.s. 4 (1962) 25-50
351. Shear, J. P. 'Athenian Imperial coinage', *Hesperia* 5 (1936) 285-332
352. Smith, H. R. W. 'Problems historical and numismatic in the reign of Augustus', *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology* 11, 4. Berkeley, 1951
353. Spijkerman, A. *The Coins of the Decapolis and Provincia Arabia*. Jerusalem, 1978
354. Sutherland, C. H. V. *Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy*. London, 1951; repr. 1971
355. Sutherland, C. H. V. *The Cistophori of Augustus*. London, 1970
356. Sutherland, C. H. V. *The Emperor and the Coinage. Julio-Claudian Studies*. London, 1976
357. Sutherland, C. H. V. *The Roman Imperial Coinage*. 1. Rev. edn. London, 1984
358. Sutherland, C. H. V. *Roman History and Coinage 44 B.C.-A.D. 69*. Oxford, 1987
359. Sutherland, C. H. V. and Kraay, C. M. *Catalogue of the Coins of the Roman Empire in the Ashmolean Museum* 1. Oxford, 1975
360. Sydenham, E. A. *The Coinage of the Roman Republic*. London, 1952
361. Walker, D. R. *The Metrology of the Roman Silver Coinage 1 From Augustus to*

- Domitian* (British Archaeological Reports, Supplementary Series 5). Oxford, 1976
362. Wallace-Hadrill, A. 'Image and authority in the coinage of Augustus', *JRS* 76 (1986) 66–87
363. Wruck, W. *Die syrische Provinzialprägung von Augustus bis Traian*. Stuttgart, 1931
364. Zehnacker, H. *Tensions et contradictions dans l'empire au 1^{er} siècle: les témoignages numismatiques* (Entretiens Hardt 33) 321–57. Vandoeuvres–Geneva, 1987

4. PAPYROLOGY

365. Badian, E. 'Notes on the Laudatio of Agrippa', *CJ* 76 (1980/1) 97–109
366. Balconi, C. 'Documenti greci e latini d'Egitto di età augustea', *Aegyptus* 56 (1976) 208–86
367. Bowman, A. K. 'Papyri and Roman imperial history, 1960–1975', *JRS* 66 (1976) 153–74
368. Fink, R. O., Hoey, A. S. and Snyder, W. F. 'The *Feriale Duranum*', *YCS* 7 (1940) 1–222
369. Gray, E. W. 'The imperium of M. Agrippa, a note on P. Colon. inv. No. 4701', *ZPE* 6 (1970) 227–38
370. Gronewald, M. 'Ein neues Fragment der Laudatio Funeris des Augustus auf Agrippa', *ZPE* 52 (1983) 61–2
371. Haslam, M. W. 'Augustus' funeral oration for Agrippa', *CJ* 75 (1979/80) 193–9
372. Koenen, L. 'Die laudatio funeris des Augustus für Agrippa auf einem neuen Papyrus (P. Colon. inv. Nr. 4701)', *ZPE* 5 (1970) 217–83 (see also 6 (1970) 239–43)
373. Lewis, N. 'P. Oxy. 2820. Whose preparations?', *GRBS* 16 (1975) 295–303
374. Lewis, N. 'P. Oxy. 2820: Gallus ... Vous dites Gallus?' *CE* 123/124 (1987) 219–22
375. Lewis, N., Yadin, Y. and Greenfield, J. C. (eds.) *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Greek Papyri (including Aramaic and Nabatean Signatures and Subscriptions)*. Jerusalem, 1989
376. Luppe, W. 'P. Oxy. 2820. Ein Bericht über die politische Tätigkeit des Cornelius Gallus?', *APF* 26 (1978) 33–8
377. *Masada I: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965. Final Reports. The Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca and Jar Inscriptions*, edited by Y. Yadin and J. Naveh. Jerusalem, 1989
378. *Masada II: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965. Final Reports. The Latin and Greek Documents*, edited by H. M. Cotton and J. Geiger. Jerusalem, 1989
379. Mitteis, L. and Wilcken, U. *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*. 4 vols. Leipzig–Berlin, 1911–12
380. Montevecchi, O. *La Papirologia*. 2nd edn. Milan, 1988
381. Musurillo, H. *The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum*. Oxford, 1954

382. Musurillo, H. (ed.) *Acta Alexandrinorum*. Leipzig, 1961
383. Reinhold, M. 'Marcus Agrippa's son-in-law, P. Quinctilius Varus', *CPb* 67 (1972) 119-21
384. Sherck, R. K. 'The last two lines of the Laudatio Funebis for Agrippa', *ZPE* 41 (1981) 67-9
385. Skeat, T. C. 'The Augustan era in Egypt. A note on P. Oxy. xii 1453', *ZPE* 53 (1983) 241-4
386. Tcherikover, V. A., Fuks, A., Stern, M. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA, 1957-64
387. Treu, M. 'Nach Kleopatras Tod (P. Oxy. 2820)', *Chiron* 3 (1973) 221-33
388. Wilcken, U. *Griechische Ostraka aus Ägypten und Nubien*. 2 vols. Leipzig-Berlin, 1899

C. POLITICAL HISTORY

1. THE TRIUMVIRAL PERIOD AND THE REIGN OF AUGUSTUS

1. Adcock, F. E. 'The interpretation of *Res gestae diui Augusti* 34,1', *CQ* 45 (1951) 130-5 (and in German in C 208, 230-40)
2. Adcock, F. E. 'A note on *Res gestae diui Augusti* 34, 3', *JRS* 42 (1952) 10-12
3. Aigner, H. *Die Soldaten als Machtfaktor in der ausgehenden Republik*. Innsbruck, 1974
4. Alföldy, G. 'Die Ablehnung der Diktatur durch Augustus', *Gymn.* 79 (1972) 1-12
5. André, J. M. *Mécène. Essai de biographie spirituelle*. Paris, 1967
6. André, J. M. *Le siècle d'Auguste*. Paris, 1974
7. André, J. M. 'Mécène écrivain', *ANRW* II, 30.3 (1983) 1765-87
8. Anello, P. 'La fine del secondo triumvirato', *Φιλίας Χάρις* (*Miscellanea in onore di Eugenio Manni*) I 103-14. Rome, 1980
9. Arangio-Ruiz, V. 'La legislazione', in C 12A, 101-46
10. Astin, A. E. 'Augustus and *censoria potestas*', *Latomus* 22 (1963) 226-35
11. Atkinson, K. M. T. 'The governors of the province Asia in the reign of Augustus', *Hist.* 7 (1958) 300-30
12. Atkinson, K. M. T. 'Constitutional and legal aspects of the trials of Marcus Primus and Varro Murena', *Hist.* 9 (1960) 440-73
- 12A. *Augustus: Studi in occasione del bimillenario augusteo*. Rome, 1938
13. Badian, E. 'The quaestorship of Tiberius Nero', *Mnemosyne* 27 (1974) 160-72
14. Badian, E. '"Crisis theories" and the beginning of the principate', in A 107A, 18-41
15. Badot, P. 'A propos de la conspiration de M. Egnatius Rufus', *Latomus* 32 (1973) 606-15
16. Barnes, T. D. 'The date of Herod's death', *JTS* 19 (1968) 204-9
17. Barnes, T. D. 'Julia's child', *Phoenix* 35 (1981) 362-3
18. Bastomsky, S. J. 'Procleius and Augustus. A note on a friendship turned sour', *Latomus* 36 (1977) 129-31

Religious History of the Second Commonwealth. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1962-78

F. SOCIETY, RELIGION AND CULTURE

1. SOCIETY AND ITS INSTITUTIONS

1. Alföldy, G. *The Social History of Rome*. London, revd edn. 1988
2. Astolfi, R. *La lex Iulia et Papia*. 2nd edn. Padua, 1986
3. Atkinson, K. M. 'The purpose of the manumission laws of Augustus', *IJ* n.s. 1 (1966) 356-74
4. Badian, E. 'A phantom marriage-law', *Philologus* 129 (1985) 82-98
5. Barrow, R. H. *Slavery in the Roman Empire*. London, 1928
6. Bauman, R. A. 'Some remarks on the structure and survival of the *quaestio de adulteriis*', *Antichthon* 2 (1968) 68-93
7. Besnier, R. 'Properce (Elégies II, vii et viiA) et le premier échec de la législation démographique d'Auguste', *RHD* 57 (1979) 191-203
8. Bollinger, T. *Theatralis licentia: die Publikumsdemonstrationen an den öffentlichen Spielen im Rom*. Winterthur, 1969
9. Bouvrie, S. des 'Augustus' legislation on morals. Which morals and what aims? *SymbOsl* 59 (1984) 93-113
10. Bradley, K. R. *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire. A Study in Social Control* (Coll. Latomus 185). Brussels, 1984; repr. New York, 1987
11. Brunt, P. A. "'Amicitia" in the late Roman Republic', *PCPhS* n.s. 11 (1965) 1-20 (= Seager, R. (ed.) *The Crisis of the Roman Republic*. Cambridge, 1969 = revd in A 11, 351-81)
12. Brunt, P. A. *Social Conflicts in the Roman Republic*. London, 1971
13. Brunt, P. A. 'Two great Roman landowners', *Latomus* 34 (1975) 619-35
14. Brunt, P. A. 'Nobilitas and novitas', *JRS* 72 (1982) 1-17
15. Brunt, P. A. 'Clientela', in A 11, 382-442
16. Cameron, A. *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*. Oxford, 1976
17. Clavel-Lévêque, M. *L'Empire en Jeux*. Paris, 1984
18. Cohen, B. 'La notion d'"ordo" dans la Rome antique', *BAGB* 1975, 259-82
19. Corte, F. della. 'Le leges Iuliae e l'elegia romana', *ANRW* II, 30. 1 (1982) 539-58
20. Crawford, M. H. 'Greek intellectuals and the Roman aristocracy in the first century B.C.', in Garnsey, P. D. A. and Whittaker, C. R. (eds.) *Imperialism in the Ancient World*, 193-207. Cambridge, 1978
21. Crook, J. A. *Law and Life of Rome*. London, 1967
22. D'Arms, J. H. *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, MA, 1981
23. D'Arms, J. H. 'Control, companionship and clientela: some social functions of the Roman communal meal', *CV* 28 (1984) 327-48

24. D'Arms, J. H. 'The Roman *convivium* and equality', in Murray, O. (ed.) *Symptica: a Symposion on the Symposion*. Oxford, 1990
25. De Ruyt, C. *Macellum, marché alimentaire des romains*. Louvain, 1985
26. Dixon, S. 'Infirmis sexus: womanly weakness in Roman law', *TvR* 52 (1984) 343-71
- 26A. Dixon, S. *The Roman Mother*. London, 1988
27. Domenicis, M. de. 'La *Latinitas Iuniana* e la legge Elia Senzia', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire offerts à André Piganiol* III, 1419-31. Paris, 1966
28. Duff, A. M. *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge, 1928; 2nd edn. 1958
29. Duncan-Jones, R.-P. 'Demographic change and economic progress under the Roman Empire', in *Tecnologia, economia e società nel mondo romano* (= Proceedings of the Como conference of 1979), 67-80. Como, 1980
30. Flambard, M. 'Collegia compitalicia: phénomène associatif, cadres territoriaux et cadres civiques dans le monde romain à l'époque républicaine', *Ktema* 6 (1981) 143-66
31. Frézouls, E. 'Le theatrum lapideum et son contexte politique', in *Théâtre et spectacles dans l'Antiquité, Actes du colloque de Strasbourg (1981)*, 193-214. Leiden, 1983
32. Galinsky, G. K. 'Augustus' legislation on morals and marriage', *Philologus* 125 (1981) 126-44
33. Gardner, J. F. *Women in Roman Law and Society*. London, 1986
34. Gardner, J. F. 'Proofs of status in the Roman world', *BICS* 33 (1986) 1-14
35. Garnsey, P. *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 1970
36. Garnsey, P. 'Urban property investment', in A 27, 123-36
37. Garnsey, P. (ed.) *Non-Slave Labour in the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge, 1980
38. Garnsey, P. 'Descendants of freedmen in local politics: some criteria', in Levick, B. M. (ed.) *The Ancient Historian and his Materials. Essays in Honour of C. E. Stevens on his Seventieth Birthday*, 167-80. Farnborough, 1975
39. Hands, A. R. *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome*. London, 1968
40. Harris, W. V. 'On the applicability of the concept of class in Roman history', in A 111, 598-610
41. Hopkins, M. K. 'The age of Roman girls at marriage', *Population Studies* 18 (1965) 309-27
42. Ladage, D. 'Soziale Aspekte des Kaiserkultes', in Eck, W. et al. (eds.) *Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte* (= *Festschrift F. Vittinghoff*), 377-88. Köln, 1980
43. MacMullen, R. 'Market days in the Roman Empire', *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 333-41
44. MacMullen, R. *Roman Social Relations 50 B.C. to A.D. 284*. New Haven, 1974
45. Montagna Pasquinucci, M. (ed.) *Terme romane e vita quotidiana*. Modena, 1987
46. Mrozek, S. 'Crustulum et mulsum dans les villes italiennes', *Athenaeum* 50 (1972) 294-300

47. *Nécropoles à incinération du Haut-Empire, Actes de la table ronde de Lyon 1986*. Lyons, 1987
48. Nicolet, C. 'Plèbe et tribus. Les statues de Lucius Antonius et le testament d'Auguste', *MEFRA* 97 (1985) 799-839
49. Purcell, N. 'The *apparitores*: a study in social mobility', *PBSR* 51 (1983) 125-73
50. Purcell, N. 'Livia and the womanhood of Rome', *PCPhS* 212 (1986) 78-105
51. Purcell, N. 'Town in country and country in town', in MacDougall, E. B. (ed.) *The Ancient Roman Villa Garden*, 188-203. Washington, DC, 1987
52. Purcell, N. 'Tomb and suburb', in Hesberg, H. von and Zanker, P. (eds.) *Römische Gräberstrassen*, 25-41. Munich, 1987
53. Raditsa, L. F. 'Augustus' legislation concerning marriage, procreation, love-affairs and adultery', *ANRW* II, 13 (1980) 278-339
54. Rawson, B. *The Family in Ancient Rome. New Perspectives*. London, 1986
55. Rawson, E. D. 'Theatrical life in Rome and Italy', *PBSR* 53 (1985) 97-113
56. Rawson, E. D. 'Discrimina ordinum: the Lex Iulia Theatralis', *PBSR* 55 (1987) 83-114
57. Robert, L. *Les gladiateurs dans l'orient grec*. Limoges, 1940; repr. Amsterdam, 1971
58. Royden, H. *The Magistrates of the Roman Professional Collegia in Italy from the First to the Third Centuries A.D.* Pisa, 1988
59. Saller, R. *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*. Cambridge, 1982
60. Saller, R. 'Men's age at marriage and its consequences in the Roman family', *CPh* 82 (1987) 21-34
61. Scheid, J. *Les frères Arvales. Recrutement et origine sociale sous les empereurs julio-claudiens*. Paris, 1975
62. Scheid, J. 'Les prêtres officiels sous les empereurs julio-claudiens', *ANRW* II, 16.1 (1978) 610-54
63. Schumacher, L. 'Die vier höhen römischen Priesterkollegien unter den Flaviern, den Antoninen und den Severern (69-235 n. Chr.)', *ANRW* II, 16.1 (1978) 655-819
64. Setälä, P. *Private Domini in Roman Brick Stamps of the Empire. A Historical and Prosopographical Study of Landowners in the District of Rome* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Dissertationes humanarum litterarum 10). Helsinki, 1977
65. Shaw, B. D. 'The age of Roman girls at marriage: some reconsiderations', *JRS* 77 (1987) 30-46
66. Spruit, J. E. *De lex Iulia et Papia Poppaea. Beschouwingen over de bevolkingspolitiek van Augustus* (Univ. of Leiden Inaugural Lecture). Deventer, 1969
67. Toynbee, J. *Death and Burial in the Roman World*. London, 1971
68. Treggiari, S. *Roman Freedmen During the Late Republic*. Oxford, 1969
69. Treggiari, S. 'Lower-class women in the Roman economy', *Florilegium* 1 (1979) 65-86
70. Treggiari, S. *Roman Marriage. Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford, 1991

71. Veyne, P. *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*. Paris, 1976 (Translated and abridged as *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*. London, 1990)
72. Wacke, A. 'Manumissio matrimonii causa: le mariage d'affranchies d'après les lois d'Auguste, RD 67 (1989) 413-28
73. Wallace-Hadrill, A. 'Family and inheritance in the Augustan marriage laws', *PCPhS* 207, n.s. 27 (1981) 58-80
74. Wallace-Hadrill, A. 'Propaganda and dissent? Augustan moral legislation and the love-poets', in A 54A, 180-4
75. Wallace-Hadrill, A., ed. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London, 1989
76. Wallace-Hadrill, A. 'Patronage in Roman society', in F 75, 63-87
77. Weaver, P. R. C. 'Cognomina ingenua, a note', *CQ* 14 (1964) 311-15
78. White, P. 'Amicitia and the profession of poetry in early imperial Rome', *JRS* 68 (1978) 74-92
79. White, P. 'Positions for poets in early imperial Rome', in A 39A, 50-66
80. Whitehead, D. 'The measure of a millionaire: what Crassus really said', *LCM* 11 (1986) 71-4
81. Wiseman, T. P. 'Conspicui postes templaque digna deo: the public image of aristocratic and imperial houses in the late Republic and early Empire', in A 96, 393-413
82. Witherington, B. *Women in the Earliest Churches*. Cambridge, 1988

2. RELIGION

83. Alföldi, A. *Die zwei Lorbeerbäume des Augustus*. Bonn, 1973
84. Altheim, F. *A History of Roman Religion* (transl. by H. Mattingly). London, 1938
85. Barnes, T. D. 'Legislation against the Christians', *JRS* 58 (1968) 32-50
86. Barton, I. M. 'Capitoline temples in Italy and the Provinces (especially Africa)', *ANRW* II, 12.1 (1982) 259-342
87. Bauer, W. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Philadelphia, 1971
88. Bayet, J. *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (BEFAR 132). Rome, 1926
89. Bayet, J. 'Les sacerdoces romains et la pré-divinisation impériale', *Bull. Acad. royale de Belgique, cl. des lettres* 41 (1955) 453-527 (= *Croyances et rites dans la Rome antique*, 275-336. Paris, 1971)
90. Beard, M. Review of McBain 1982 (F 177), *Gnomon* 55 (1983) 510-13
91. Beard, M. 'Writing and ritual: a study of diversity and expansion in the Arval Acta', *PBSR* 53 (1985) 114-62
92. Beard, M. 'A complex of times: no more sheep on Romulus' birthday', *PCPhS* n.s. 33 (1987) 1-15
- 92A. Beard, M. and North, J. *Pagan Priests*. London, 1990
93. Beaujeu, J. *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'empire* 1. Paris, 1955
94. Becher, I. 'Tiberüberschwemmungen. Die Interpretation von Prodigien in augusteischer Zeit', *Klio* 67 (1985) 471-9
95. Bianchi, A. 'Disegno storico del culto Capitolino nell'Italia romana e nelle provincie dell'Impero', *Atti Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* (Memorie, Sc. morali, 8th ser., II. 7). Rome, 1949

96. Bickerman, E. J. 'Filius Maiæ (Horace, Odes, 1.2.43)', *PP* 16 (1961) 5-19 (= *Religions and Politics in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, 453-69. Como, 1985)
97. Bömer, F. 'Kybele in Rom', *MDAI(R)* 71 (1964) 130-51
98. Bömer, F. 'Wie ist Augustus mit Vesta verwandt?', *Gymn.* 94 (1987) 525-8
99. Bornkamm, G. *Jesus of Nazareth*. London, 1960
100. Bousset, W. *Kyrios Christos*. London, 1970
101. Bowker, J. *Jesus and the Pharisees*. Cambridge, 1973
102. Boyancé, P. 'Properce aux fêtes de quartier', *REA* 52 (1950) 64-70 (= *Etudes sur la religion romaine* (Collection de l'école française de Rome 11), 291-7. Rome, 1972)
103. Boyancé, P. 'Cybèle aux Mégalesies', *Latomus* 13 (1954) 337-42 (= *Etudes sur la religion romaine* (Collection de l'école française de Rome 11), 195-200. Rome, 1972)
104. Brelich, A. 'Offerte e interdizioni alimentari nel culto della Magna Mater a Roma', *SMSR* 36 (1965) 27-42
105. Bremmer, J. and Horsfall, N. *Roman Myth and Mythography* (*BICS*, Suppl. 52). London, 1987
106. Brind'amour, P. 'L'origine des jeux séculaires', *ANRW* II, 16 (1978) 1353-71
107. Brunt, P. A. 'Stoicism and the principate', *PBSR* 43 (1975) 7-35
108. Burnett, A. Review of Rainer, A. *Das Bild des Augustus auf den frühen Reichsprägungen*, *Gnomon* 55 (1983) 563-5
109. Cannadine, D. and Price, S. (eds.) *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*. Cambridge, 1987
110. Catalano, P. 'Aspetti spaziali del sistema giuridico-religioso romano. Mundus, templum, urbs, ager, Latium, Italia', *ANRW* II, 16.1 (1978) 440-553
111. Cerfaux, L. and Tondriaux, J. *Un concurrent du Christianisme. Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine*. Tournai, 1957
112. Chadwick, H. *The Early Church*. Harmondsworth, 1968
113. Charlesworth, J. H. *Jesus Within Judaism*. New York, 1988
114. Charlesworth, M. P. 'The virtues of the Roman emperor. Propaganda and the creation of belief', *PBA* (1937) 105-33
115. Charlesworth, M. P. 'The refusal of divine honours, an Augustan formula', *PBSR* 2 (1939) 1-10
116. Coarelli, F. 'Il Pantheon, l'apoteosi di Augusto e l'apoteosi di Romolo', *Città e architettura nella Roma imperiale* (*Analecta Romana*, Suppl. 10), 41-6. Odense, 1983
117. Collins, J. J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: an Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*. New York, 1987
118. Daniélou, J. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*. London, 1964
119. Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. 4th edn. London, 1980
120. Diels, H. *Sibyllinische Blätter*. Berlin, 1890
121. Dilke, O. A. W. 'Religious mystique in the training of Agrimensores', *Hommages à Henri Le Bonniec* (Coll. Latomus 201) 158-62. Brussels, 1988

122. Dumézil, G. 'Augur', *REL* 35 (1957) 126-51 (= F 123, 79-102)
123. Dumézil, G. *Idées romaines*. Paris, 1969
124. Dumézil, G. *Archaic Roman Religion*. 2 vols. Chicago, 1970
125. Dumézil, G. *Fêtes romaines d'été et d'automne*. Paris, 1975
126. Dunn, J. D. G. *Christology in the Making*. 2nd edn. London, 1990
127. Duthoy, R. 'Recherches sur la répartition géographique et chronologique des termes *sevir augustalis*, *augustalis* et *sevir* dans l'Empire romain', *EpStud* 11 (Köln, 1976) 143-214
128. Duthoy, R. 'Les Augustales', *ANRW* II, 16. 2 (1978) 1254-309
129. Erckell, H. *Augustus, Felicitas, Fortuna. Lateinische Wortstudien*. Gothenburg, 1952
130. Erckell, H. 'Ludi saeculares und ludi Latini saeculares', *Eranos* 67 (1969) 166-74
131. Esler, P. F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: the Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Cambridge, 1987
132. Evans, C. F. 'The New Testament in the making', *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 1, 232-84. Cambridge, 1970
133. Fauth, W. 'Römische Religion im Spiegel der "Fasti" des Ovid', *ANRW* II, 16.1 (1978) 104-86
134. Fayer, C. *Il culto della dea Roma*. Pescara, 1976
135. Fishwick, D. 'Genius and Numen', *HTR* 62 (1969) 356-67
136. Fishwick, D. 'The development of provincial ruler worship in the western Roman empire', *ANRW* II, 16.2 (1978) 1201-53
137. Fishwick, D. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* 1 (EPRO 108). Leiden, 1987
138. Fredriksen, P. *From Jesus to Christ: the Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus*. New Haven, 1988
139. Friend, W. H. C. *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*. Oxford, 1965
140. Friend, W. H. C. *The Rise of Christianity*. London, 1984
141. Gagé, J. 'Romulus-Augustus', *MEFRA* 47 (1930) 138-81
142. Gagé, J. 'Les sacerdoces d'Auguste et ses réformes religieuses', *MEFRA* 48 (1931) 75-108
143. Gagé, J. 'Recherches sur les jeux séculaires II. Ce que nous apprennent les nouveaux fragments épigraphiques', *REL* 11 (1933) 172-202 (= *Recherches sur les Jeux Séculaires*, 45-75. Paris, 1934)
- 143A. Gagé, J. 'Recherches sur les jeux séculaires III. Jeux séculaires et jubilé de la fondation de Rome', *REL* 11 (1933) 400-35 (= *Recherches sur les Jeux Séculaires*, 77-111. Paris, 1934)
144. Gagé, J. 'Actiaca', *MEFRA* 53 (1936) 37-100
145. Gagé, J. 'Le "Templum Urbis" et les origines de l'idée de "Renovatio"', *Mélanges F. Cumont* 1, 151-87. Brussels, 1936
146. Gagé, J. *Apollon romain. Essai sur le culte d'Apollon et le développement du 'ritus Graecus' à Rome des origines à Auguste*. Paris, 1955
147. Gager, J. G. *Kingdom and Community: the Social World of Early Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs, 1975
148. Gordon, R. L. 'The veil of power: emperors, sacrificers, and benefactors', in F 92A, 201-31

149. Grant, F. C. *Hellenistic Religions*. New York, 1953
150. Grant, F. C. *Ancient Roman Religion*. New York, 1957
151. Grant, M. *Roman Myths*. Harmondsworth, 1973
152. Grant, R. M. *Gods and the One God*. Philadelphia, 1986
153. Guarducci, M. 'Enea e Vesta', *MDAI(R)*. 78 (1971) 73-118 (= *Scritti scelti sulla religione greca a romana e sul cristianesimo*, 198-243. Leiden, 1983)
154. Habicht, C. 'Die augusteische Zeit und das erste Jahrhundert nach Christi Geburt', *Le culte des souverains dans l'empire romain* (Entretiens Hardt 19) 39-99. Vandoeuvres, 1973
155. Harvey, A. E. *Jesus and the Constraints of History*. London, 1982
156. Hock, R. F. *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship*. Philadelphia, 1980
157. Holladay, A. J. and Goodman, M. D. 'Religious scruples in ancient warfare', *CQ* n.s. 36 (1986) 151-71
158. Jal, P. 'Les dieux et les guerres civiles dans la Rome de la fin de la République', *REL* 40 (1962) 170-200
159. Judge, E. A. *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century*. London, 1960
160. Kee, H. C. *Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times*. Cambridge, 1986
161. Knoche, U. 'Die augusteische Ausprägung der Dea Roma', *Gymn.* 59 (1952) 324-49 (= *Vom Selbstverständnis der Römer, Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Gymn. Beiheft 2 (Heidelberg, 1962) no. 5), 145-73)
162. Koch, C. *Der römische Juppiter*. Frankfurt, 1937
163. Koch, C. 'Der altrömische Staatskult im Spiegel augusteischer und spätrepublikanischer Apologetik', in *Convivium. Festschrift Konrat Ziegler*, 85-120. Stuttgart, 1954 (= *Religio. Studien zu Kult und Glauben der Römer*, 176-204. Nuremberg, 1960)
164. Koepfel, G. M. 'Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit II', *BJ* 184 (1984) 1-65
165. La Rocca, E. *La riva a mezzaluna. Culti, agoni, monumenti funerari presso il Tevere nel Campo Marzio occidentale*. Rome, 1984
166. Ladage, D. 'Städtischer Priester- und Kultämter im lateinischen Westen des Imperium Romanum zur Kaiserzeit'. Diss., Cologne, 1971
167. Lambrechts, P. 'Cybèle, divinité étrangère ou nationale?', *Société royale belge d'anthropologie et de préhistoire* 62 (1951) 44-60
168. Lambrechts, P. 'Les fêtes "phrygiennes" de Cybèle et d'Attis', *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 27 (1952) 141-70
169. Latte, K. 'Über eine Eigentümlichkeit der italischen Gottesvorstellung', *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 24 (1926/7) 244-58 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 76-90. Munich, 1968)
170. Latte, K. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich, 1960
171. Le Gall, J. 'Les Romains et l'orientation solaire', *MEFR* 87 (1975) 287-320
172. Levi, M. A. 'Il ciclo religioso augusteo e il superamento delle guerre civili', *CISA* 10 (1984) 181-93
173. Lewis, M. W. H. *The Official Priests of Rome under the Julio-Claudians* (Papers and Monographs of the Amer. Acad. Rome 16). Rome, 1955

174. Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford, 1979
175. Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 'The religious position of Livy's History', *JRS* 57 (1967) 45-55
176. Lüdemann, G. *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity*. Minneapolis, 1989
177. McBain, B. *Prodigy and Expiation: a Study in Religion and Politics in Republican Rome* (Coll. Latomus 177). Brussels, 1982
178. MacDonald, M. Y. *The Pauline Churches: a Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. Cambridge, 1988
179. MacMullen R. *Paganism in the Roman Empire*. New Haven-London, 1981
180. Magdelain, A. *Recherches sur l'Imperium, la loi curiate et les auspices d'investiture*. Paris, 1968
181. Magdelain, A. 'L'inauguration de l'urbs et l'imperium', *MEFR* 89 (1977) 11-29
182. Malherbe, A. J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. 2nd edn. Philadelphia, 1983
183. Meeks, W. A. *The First Urban Christians. The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven, 1983
184. Meeks, W. A. *The Moral World of the First Christians*. Philadelphia, 1986
185. Meeks, W. A. and Wilkens, R. L. *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era*. Missoula, MT, 1978
186. Mellor, R. *ΘΕΑ ΡΩΜΗ: the Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World* (Hypomnemata 42). Göttingen, 1975
187. Merkelbach, R. 'Aeneas in Cumae', *MH* 18 (1961) 83-99
188. Meslin, M. *L'homme romain, des origines au 1^{er} siècle de notre ère. Essai d'anthropologie*. Paris, 1978
189. Momigliano, A. D. Review of Sherwin-White, A. N. *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, 1939), *JRS* 31 (1941) 158-65
190. Niebling, G. 'Laribus Augustis magistri primi. Der Beginn des Compitalkultes der Lares und des Genius Augusti', *Hist.* 5 (1956) 303-31
191. Nilsson, M. P. 'Saeculares ludi', *RE* 1 A (1920) 1696-720
192. Nock, A. D. 'Religious developments from the close of the Republic to the reign of Nero', *CAH* x¹, 465-511. Cambridge, 1934
193. Nock, A. D. 'The Roman army and the Roman religious year', *HTR* 45 (1952) 186-252 (= *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, 736-90. 2 vols. Oxford, 1972)
194. North, J. 'Conservatism and change in Roman religion', *PBSR* 44 (1976) 1-12
195. North, J. 'Religion and politics, from Republic to Principate', *JRS* 76 (1986) 251-8
196. O'Connor, D. W. *Peter in Rome. The Literary, Liturgical and Archaeological Evidence*. New York-London, 1969
197. Pettazzoni, R. 'La religione', in *C* 12A, 217-49
198. Pötscher, W. "'Numen" und "Numen Augusti"', *ANRW* II, 16.1 (1978) 355-92

199. Price, S. R. F. *Rituals and Power: the Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. Cambridge, 1984
200. Price, S. R. F. 'From noble funerals to divine cult: the consecration of Roman emperors', in *F* 109, 56-105
201. Price, S. R. F. 'The City of Rome', in Beard, M., North, J. and Price, S. (eds.) *Religions of Rome* 1. Cambridge, 1996
202. Raubitschek, A. E. 'Octavia's deification at Athens', *TAPA* 77 (1946) 146-50
203. Rawson, E. D. 'Scipio, Laelius, and the ancestral religion', *JRS* 63 (1973) 161-74
204. Richard, J.-C. 'Les funérailles de Trajan et le triomphe sur les Parthes', *REL* 44 (1966) 351-62
205. Ristow, G. 'Götter und Kulte in den Rheinlanden', in *Römer am Rhein*, 57-69. Cologne, 1967
206. Roberts, C. H. *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*. London, 1979
207. Rohde, G. *Die Kultsatzungen der römischen Pontifices*. RVV 25 (Berlin, 1936)
208. Rowland, C. *Christian Origins: from Messianic Movement to Christian Religion*. London, 1985
209. Ryberg, I. S. *Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art* (*MAAR* 22). Rome, 1955
210. Sabbatucci, D. 'Mito e demitizzazione nell'antica Roma', *SMSR* 41 (= *Religione e civiltà* 1 (1970-2) 339-89)
211. Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: a Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London, 1977
212. Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. London, 1985
213. Sanders, E. P. et al. (eds.) *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1980-2
214. Santero, J. M. 'The "Cultores Augusti" and the first worship of the Roman emperor', *Athenaeum* 61 (1983) 111-25
215. Saulnier, C. 'Le rôle des prêtres fétiaux et l'application du "ius fetiale" à Rome', *RHDFE* 58 (1980) 171-90
216. Saulnier, C. 'Laurens Lavinus. Quelques remarques à propos d'un sacerdoce équestre à Rome', *Latomus* 43 (1984) 517-33
217. Scheid, J. *Religion et piété à Rome*. Paris, 1985
218. Scheid, J. 'Les sanctuaires de confins dans la Rome antique', in *A* 96, 583-95
219. Schilling, R. 'Ovide interprète de la religion romaine', *REL* 46 (1969) 222-35. (= *Rites, cultes, dieux de Rome*, 11-22. Paris, 1979)
220. Schippman, K. *Die iranischen Feuerheiligtümer*. Berlin, 1971
221. Scholz, U. W. *Studien zum altitalischen und altrömischen Marskult und Marsmythos*. Heidelberg, 1970
222. Scott, K. 'The identification of Augustus with Romulus-Quirinus', *TAPA* 56 (1925) 82-105
223. Scullard, H. H. *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*. London, 1981

224. Segal, A. F. *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World*. Cambridge, MA-London, 1986
225. Syme, R. 'The pomerium in the Historia Augusta', *Bonner Historia Augusta Congress 1975-6* (1978) 217ff (= *Historia Augusta Papers*, 131-45. Oxford, 1983)
226. Tamassia, A. M. 'Iscrizioni del Compitum Acili', *BCAR* 78 (1961-2) 158-63
227. Teixidor, J. *The Pagan God. Popular Religion in the Greco-Roman Near East*. Princeton, 1977
228. Theissen, G. *The First Followers of Jesus: a Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christians*. London, 1978
229. Theissen, G. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*. Philadelphia, 1982
230. Van Doren, M. 'L'évolution des mystères phrygiens à Rome', *AC* 22 (1953) 79-88
231. Vermes, G. *Jesus the Jew*. London, 1976
232. Versnel, H. S. 'Die neue Inschrift von Satricum in historischer Sicht', *Gymn.* 89 (1982) 193-235
233. Warde Fowler, W. *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*. London, 1911
234. Watson, F. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*. Cambridge, 1986
235. Weinstock, S. *Divus Iulius*. Oxford, 1971
236. Whatmough, J. 'The calendar in ancient Italy outside Rome', *HSCP* 42 (1931) 157-79
237. Wiedemann, T. 'The *Fetiales*: a reconsideration', *CQ* 36 (1986) 478-90
238. Wilhelm, J. 'Das römische Sakralwesen unter Augustus als Pontifex Maximus'. Diss., Strasburg, 1915
239. Winter, J. G. 'The myth of Hercules at Rome', in Sanders, H. A. (ed.) *Roman History and Mythology*, 171-273. London, 1910
240. Wiseman, T. P. 'Cybele, Virgil and Augustus', in B 204, 117-28. Cambridge, 1984
241. Wissowa, G. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd edn. Munich, 1912; repr. 1971
242. Wissowa, G. 'Die römischen Staatspriestertümer altlateinischer Gemeindekulte', *Hermes* 50 (1915) 1-33
243. Zanker, P. 'Der Larenaltar im Belvedere des Vatikans', *MDAI(R)* 76 (1969) 205-18

3. ART AND ARCHITECTURE

244. Albert, R. *Das Bild des Augustus auf den frühen Reichsprägungen. Studien zur Vergöttlichung des ersten Prinzipes* (Diss., Mannheim, 1980). Speyer, 1981
245. Albertson, F. C. 'An Augustan temple represented on a historical relief dating to the time of Claudius', *AJA* 91 (1987) 441-50
246. Alföldi, A. *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im römischen Denken*. (Contains his papers 'Die Geburt der kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik' from *MH* 7 (1950) 1-13; 8 (1951) 190-215; 9 (1952) 204-43; 10 (1953) 103-24; 11 (1954) 133-69.) Darmstadt, 1971

247. Alföldi, A. *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche*. 3rd edn. (Contains his papers 'Die Ausgestaltung des monarchischen Zeremoniells am römischen Kaiserhofe', *MDAI(R)* 49 (1934) 3-118 and 'Insignien und Tracht der römischen Kaiser', *MDAI(R)* 50 (1935) 3-158.) Darmstadt, 1970
248. Alzinger, W. *Augusteische Architektur in Ephesos*. Vienna, 1974
249. Amelung, W. and Lippold, G. *Die Skulpturen des Vaticanischen Museums*. 4 vols. Berlin, 1903-56
250. Anderson, M. L. 'The portrait medallions of the imperial villa at Boscotrecase', *AJA* 91 (1987) 127-35
251. Anderson, W. J., Spiers, R. P. and Ashby, T. *The Architecture of Ancient Rome*. London, 1927
252. Andreae, B. 'Der Zyklus der Odysseefresken im Vatikan', *MDAI(R)* 69 (1962) 106-17
253. Andreae, B. *Römische Kunst*. Freiburg, 1973
254. *Architecture et société de l'archaïsme à la fin de la république romaine* (Atti del Colloquio di Roma). Rome, 1983
255. Arias, P. E. 'Teatro e odeon', s.v. in *EEA* VII. Rome, 1966
256. *L'art décoratif à Rome à la fin de la République et au début du Principat*. Rome, 1981
257. Ashby, T. *The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*. Oxford, 1935
258. Astolfi, F., Bauer, H., Guidobaldi, F. and Pronti, A. 'Horrea Agrippiana', *ArchClass* 30 (1978) 31-146
259. Aymard, A. and Auboyer, J. *Rome et son empire*. Paris, 1954
260. Bacchielli, L. 'Le porte romane ad ordinem sovrapposti e antecedenti greci', *MDAI(R)* 91 (1984) 79ff
261. Barbet, A. *Recueil général des peintures murales de la Gaule: 1 Province de Narbonnaise 1, Glanum* (Gallia Suppl. 27). Paris, 1974
262. Barbet, A. *La peinture murale romaine. Les styles décoratifs pompéiens*. Paris, 1985
263. Bartels, H. *Studien zum Frauenporträt der augusteischen Zeit. Fulvia, Octavia, Livia, Julia*. Munich, 1963
264. Bastet, F. L. 'Domus transitoria. I', *BABesch* 46 (1971) 144-72; II, *BABesch* 47 (1972) 61-87
265. Bastet, F. L. and Vos, M. de. *Proposta per una classificazione del terzo stile pompeiano*. The Hague, 1979
266. *Bauplanung und Bauphysik der Antike* (Deutsches Archäol. Inst., Diskussionen zur archäologischen Bauforschung 4). Berlin, 1984
267. Becatti, G. 'Le varie correnti artistiche dei periodi sillano e cesariano e la formazione dell'arte romana', in *L'età classica*, 291-385. Florence, 1965
268. Becatti, G. *L'arte romana*. Milan, 1962
269. Bejor, G. 'L'edificio teatrale nell'urbanizzazione augustea', *Athenaeum* 57 (1979) 126-38
270. Bernoulli, J. J. *Römische Ikonographie* I-III. Stuttgart, 1882-94; repr. Hildesheim, 1969
271. Beyen, H. G. *Die pompeianische Wanddekoration vom zweiten bis zum vierten Stil* I (1938); II. I (1960). Haag

272. Beyen, H. G. 'Pompeiani, Stili', s.v. in *EAA* vi. Rome, 1965
273. Bianchi Bandinelli, R. *Storicità dell'arte classica*. Florence, 1943; repr. Bari, 1973
274. Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 'Romana Arte', s.v. in *EAA* vi. Rome, 1965
275. Bianchi Bandinelli, R. *Rome, le centre du pouvoir*. Paris, 1969 (= *Roma. L'arte romana nel centro del potere*. Milan, 1969; = *Rome, the Centre of Power: Roman Art to A.D. 200*. London, 1970)
276. Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 'Noterella in margine ai problemi della pittura antica', in F 273, 245ff
277. Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 'Tradizione ellenistica e gusto romano nella pittura pompeiana', in F 273, 273ff
278. Bianchi Bandinelli, R. *Dall'Ellenismo al Medioevo*. Rome, 1978
279. Bianchi Bandinelli, R. 'Sulla formazione del ritratto romano', in *Archeologia e cultura*, 164ff. Rome, 1979
280. Bianchi Bandinelli, R. *La pittura antica*. Rome, 1980
281. Bianchi Bandinelli, R. and Torelli, M. *L'arte dell'antichità classica, Etruria-Roma*. Turin, 1976
282. Bieber, M. *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater*. Princeton, 1961
283. Bieber, M. *Ancient Copies. Contributions to the History of Greek and Roman Art*. New York, 1977
284. Blake, M. E. 'The pavements of the Roman Republic and the early Empire', *MAAR* viii (1930) 5ff
285. Blake, M. E. *Ancient Roman Construction in Italy from Tiberius through the Flavians*. Washington, 1959
286. Blanck, H. *Wiederverwendung alter Statuen als Ehrendenkmäler bei Griechen und Römern*. Rome, 1969
287. Blanckenhagen, H. von, and Alexander, C. *The Paintings from Boscotrecase*. Heidelberg, 1962
288. Bloch, H. *I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana*. Rome, 1947
289. Boatwright, M. T. *Hadrian and the City of Rome*. Princeton, 1987
290. Boethius, A. *The Golden House of Nero: Some Aspects of Roman Architecture*. Ann Arbor, 1960
291. Boethius, A. and Ward-Perkins, J. B. *Etruscan and Roman Architecture*. Harmondsworth, 1970
292. Bonanno, A. *Portraits and Other Heads on Historical Reliefs up to the Age of Septimius Severus* (BAR Supplementary Series 6). Oxford, 1976
293. Bonnefond, M. 'Transferts de fonctions et mutation idéologique: le Capitole et le Forum d'Auguste', in A 96, 251-78
294. Borbein, A. H. 'Die Ara Pacis Augustae. Geschichtliche Wirklichkeit und Programm', *JDAI* 90 (1975) 242-66
295. Borchhardt, J. 'Ein Kenotaph für Gaius Caesar', *JDAI* 89 (1974) 217-41
296. Borda, M. *La pittura romana*. Milan, 1958
297. Bragantini, I. and Vos, M. de *Museo Nazionale Romano. Le pitture: II. 1. Le decorazioni della villa romana della Farnesina*. Rome, 1982
298. Breckenridge, J. D. 'Roman Imperial portraiture from Augustus to Gallienus', *ANRW* II, 12. 2 (1981) 477-92
299. Brendel, O. *Prolegomena to the Study of Roman Art*. New Haven-London, 1979

300. Brilliant, R. *Gesture and Rank in Roman Art. The Use of Gesture to Denote Status in Roman Sculpture*. New Haven, 1963
301. Brommer, P. 'Zur Datierung des Augustus von Prima porta', in *F* 356A, 78-80
302. Brown, F. E. *Roman Architecture*. New York, 1961
303. Brunn, H. and Arndt, P. *Griechische und römische Porträts*, edited by F. Bruckmann and G. Lippold. Munich, 1891-1942
304. Buchner, E. 'Solarium Augusti und Ara Pacis', *MDAI(R)* 83 (1976) 319-65
305. Buchner, E. 'Horologium Solarium Augusti', *MDAI(R)* 87 (1980) 355-73
306. Buchner, E. *Die Sonnenuhr des Augustus*. Mainz, 1982 (Contains E 304 (pp. 7-55) and E 305 (pp. 57-77))
307. Buchner, E. 'Horologium Augusti: Neue Ausgrabungen in Rom', *Gymn.* 90 (1983) 494-508
308. Cagianò de Azevedo, M. 'I capitolia dell'impero romano', *MPAA* ser. 3 (1940)
309. Cagnat, R. and Chapot, V. *Manuel d'archéologie romaine*. 2 vols. Paris, 1916-20
310. Calci, C. and Messineo, G. *La villa di Livia a Prima Porta*. Rome, 1984
311. Camodeca, G. 'Una nuova fonte sulla topografia del foro di Augusto', *Athenaeum* 74 (1986) 505-8
312. Carandini, A. 'Domus e insulae sulla pendice settentrionale del Palatino', *BCAR* 91.2 (1986) 263-78
313. Carandini, A. and Ricci, A. (eds.) *Settefinestre. Una villa schiavistica nell'Etruria romana*. Modena, 1985
314. Carettoni, G. 'Nuove pitture del Palatino', *BdA* 40 (1955) 210ff
315. Carettoni, G. 'Roma. Le costruzioni di Augusto e il tempio di Apollo sul Palatino' (*ArchLaz* 1), *Quaderni del centro di studi per l'archeologia etrusco-italica* 1 (1978) 72-4
316. Carettoni, G. *Das Haus des Augustus auf dem Palatin*. Mainz, 1983
317. Carettoni, G. 'La decorazione pittorica della casa di Augusto sul Palatino', *MDAI(R)* 90 (1983) 373-419
318. Castagnoli, F. (ed.) *Studi di urbanistica antica*. Rome, 1966
319. Castagnoli, F. 'Sul tempio "italico"', *MDAI(R)* 73-4 (1966-7) 10-14
320. Castagnoli, F. *Orthogonal Town-Planning in Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA, 1971
321. Cavalieri Manasse, G. *La decorazione architettonica romana d'Aquileia, Trieste, Pola: 1. L'età repubblicana, augustea e giulio-claudia*. Padua, 1978
322. Cerulli Irelli, G. 'Le pitture della Casa dell'Atrio a mosaico', *MonPitt* III, vol. Ercolano I. Rome, 1971
323. Chamoux, F. 'Un portrait de Thasos, Lucius Caesar', *MMAI* 44 (1950) 83-96
324. Chamoux, F. 'Nouveaux portraits des fils d'Agrippa', *RA* 37 (1951) 218-20
325. Chamoux, F. 'Un nouveau portrait de Gaius César découvert à Mayence', *BSNAF* (1963) 205-6
326. Charbonneaux, J. *L'art au siècle d'Auguste*. Paris, 1948

327. Charbonneaux, J. 'Un portrait présumé de Marcellus', *MMAI* 51 (1960) 53-72
328. Cima, M. and La Rocca, E. *Le tranquille dimore degli dei; la residenza imperiale degli horti Lamiani*. Venice, 1986
329. *La città di fondazione* (Atti del II Congresso internaz. di studi di urbanistica). Vicenza, 1978
330. *Città e architettura della Roma imperiale* (*ARID* Supplement 10). Odense, 1983
331. Clavel, M. and Lévêque, P. *Villes et structures urbaines dans l'Occident romain*. Paris, 1971
332. Coarelli, F. *Guida Archaeologica di Roma*. Milan, 1981
333. Coarelli, F. 'Il Panteon, l'apoteosi di Augusto e l'apoteosi di Romolo', in *F* 330, 41-6
334. Colini, A. M. 'Compitum Acili', *BCAR* 78 (1961-2) 47-57
335. Colledge, M. A. R. *The Art of Palmyra*. London, 1976
336. Corlaita Scagliarini, D. 'Spazio e decorazione nella pittura pompeiana', *Palladio* 23-5 (1974-6) 3ff
337. Crema, L. *Architettura romana*. Turin, 1959
338. Cristofani, M. 'Sul rinvenimento dell'Arringatore', *Prospettiva* 45 (1986-7) 56-7
339. Croisille, J. M. *Les natures mortes campaniennes*. Brussels, 1965
340. *Les cryptoportiques dans l'architecture romaine* (Collection école française de Rome 14) 1973
341. Curtius, L. 'Ikonographische Beiträge zum Porträt der römischen Republik und der julisch-claudischen Familie', *MDAI(R)* 47 (1932) 202-68; 48 (1933) 182-243; 49 (1934) 119-56; 50 (1935) 260-320; 54 (1939) 112-44; 55 (1940) 36-64; *Mdl* 1 (1948) 53-94
342. Dacos, N. 'Fabullus et l'autre peintre de la Domus Aurea', *MEFRA* 80 (1968) 85ff
343. Danson, C. M. *Romano-Campanian Mythological Landscape Painting*. Yale, 1944
344. Darmon, J. P. 'Les mosaïques en Occident, I', *ANRW* II, 12. 2 (1981) 266-319
345. Daut, R. *Imago. Untersuchungen zum Bildbegriff der Römer*. Heidelberg, 1975
346. Degrassi, A. 'Virgilio e il foro di Augusto', *Epigraphica* 7 (1945) 88-103 (= *Scritti vari di antichità* 1, 283-97. Rome, 1962)
347. Degrassi, N. 'La dimora di Augusto sul Palatino e la base di Sorrento', *RPA* 39 (1966-7) 77-116
348. Deman, E. B. van *The Building of the Roman Aqueducts*. Washington, 1934
349. Deppert-Lippitz, B. 'Römischer Goldschmuck. Stand der Forschung', *ANRW* II, 12. 3 (1985) 117-26
350. Dondin-Payre, M. 'Topographie et propagande gentile: le *compitum Acilium* et l'origine des *Acilii Glabriones*', in *A* 96, 87-109
351. Drerup, H. *Zum Ausstattungsluxus in der römischen Architektur*. Münster, 1957
352. Drerup, H. 'Die römische Villa', in *Marburger Winckelmann-Programm*, 1-24. Marburg, 1959

353. Drerup, H. 'Architektur als Symbol', *Gymn.* 73 (1966) 181-96
354. Ducati, P. *L'arte in Roma dalle origini al secolo VIII*. Bologna, 1938
355. Duval, P.-M. and Frézouls, E. (eds.) *Thèmes de recherches sur les villes antiques d'Occident*. Paris, 1977
356. Eck, W., Fittschen, K. and Naumann, F. *Kaisersaal. Porträts aus den kapitolinischen Museen in Rom*. Rome, 1986
- 356A. *Eikones. Studien zum griechischen und römischen Bildnis* (Studien Hans Jucker) (*Antike Kunst Beiheft* 12). Berne, 1980
357. Eisner, M. *Zur Typologie der Grabbauten im Suburbium Roms*. Mainz, 1986
358. Elia, O. *Pitture di Stabia*. Naples, 1957
359. Engemann, J. *Architekturdarstellungen des frühen Zweiten Stils. Illusionistische römische Wandmalerei der ersten Phase und ihre Vorbilder in der realen Architektur*. Heidelberg, 1967
360. Evans, H. B. 'Agrippa's water plan', *AJA* 86 (1982) 401-11
361. Fabbri, L. 'Marco Vipsanio Agrippa. Concordanze e discordanze iconografiche. Nuovi contributi', in F 356A, 96-107
362. Felletti Maj, B. M. *La tradizione italiana nell'arte romana*. Rome, 1977
363. Felletti Maj, B. M. and Moreno, P. C. 'Le pitture della casa delle Muse', *MonPitt* III, vol. Ostia III. Rome, 1967
364. Fittschen, K. *Katalog der antiken Skulpturen in Schloss Erbach*. Berlin, 1977
365. Fittschen, K. and Zanker, P. *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Capitolinischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom: I. Kaiser- und Prinzenbildnisse*. Mainz 1985; III. Kaiserin- und Prinzessinnenbildnisse. Mainz, 1983
366. Flory, M. B. '"Sic exempla parantur": Livia's shrine to Concordia and the Porticus Liviae', *Hist.* 33 (1984) 309-30
367. Forni, G. 'Anfiteatro', s.v. in *EAA* I. Rome, 1958
368. Forni, G. 'Teatro', s.v. in *EAA* Suppl. Rome, 1970
369. Franciscis, A. de *La villa romana di Oplontis*. Recklinghausen, 1977
370. Fraschetti, A. 'La mort d'Agrippa et l'autel du Belvédère. Un certain type d'hommage', *MEFRA* 92 (1980) 957-76
371. Fraschetti, A. 'Morti dei "principi" ed "eroi" della famiglia di Augusto', *AION (Archeol)* 6 (1984) 151-89
372. Freyer-Schauenburg, B. 'Augustus capite uelatus. Zu einer unpublizierten Porträtbüste von Samos', in A 55A, 1-8
373. Frézouls, E. 'Aspects de l'histoire architecturale du théâtre romain', *ANRW* II, 12. 1 (1982) 343-441
374. Frova, A. *L'arte di Roma e del mondo romano*. Turin, 1961
375. Fuchs, M. *Untersuchungen zur Ausstattung römischer Theater*. Mainz, 1987
376. Fullerton, M. D. 'The Domus Augusti in imperial iconography of 13-12 B.C.', *AJA* 89 (1985) 473-83
377. Gabelmann, H. 'Römische Grabbauten in Italien und den Nordprovinzen', in *Festschr. F. Brommer*, 101-17. Mainz, 1977
378. Gabriel, M. M. *Livia's Garden Room at Prima Porta*. New York, 1955
379. Gagé, J. 'L'era del principato e le speculazioni astrologiche', in A 82A, 223-35

380. Gallina, A. *Le pitture con paesaggi dell'Odissea dall'Esquilino* (*Studi Misc.* 6 (1960-1)). Rome, 1964
381. Ganzert, J. 'Der Mars-Ulter-Tempel auf dem Augustusforum in Rom', *MDAI(R)* 92 (1985) 200-19
382. Garcia y Bellido, A. *Arte romano*. Madrid, 1957
383. Gasparri, C. 'Le pitture della caupona del pavone', *MonPitt* III, vol. Ostia IV. Rome, 1970
384. Gazzola, P. *I ponti romani* I-II. Florence, 1963
385. Gercke, W. B. 'Untersuchungen zum römischen Kinderporträt von den Anfängen bis in hadrianische Zeit'. Diss., Hamburg, 1968
386. Gerkan, A. von 'Griechische und Römische Architektur', *BJ* 152 (1952) 21-6
387. Giuliani, C. F. 'Note sull'architettura delle residenze imperiali dal I al III secolo d. Cr.', *ANRW* II, 12.1 (1982) 233-58
388. Giuliano, A. *Catalogo dei ritratti romani del Museo Profano Lateranense*. Vatican City, 1957
389. Gnoli, R. *Marmora romana*. Rome, 1971
390. Goethert, F. W. 'Studien zur Kopienforschung', *MDAI(R)* 54 (1939) 176ff
391. Golvin, J.-C. *L'amphithéâtre romain*, CNRS. Paris, 1988
392. Grieco, G. 'A propos de la statue d'Auguste de Prima Porta. Confirmation de la thèse de la création Tibérienne...', *Latomus* 38 (1979) 147-64
393. Grimal, P. *Les jardins romains*. Paris, 1969; repr. 1984
394. Grimm, G. 'Die Porträts der Triumvirn ... Überlegungen zur Entstehung und Abfolge der Bildnistypen des Kaisers Augustus', *MDAI(R)* 96 (1989) 347-64
395. Gros, P. 'Trois temples de la Fortune des I et II siècles de notre ère. Remarques sur l'origine des sanctuaires romains à abside', *MEFR* 79 (1967) 503-66
396. Gros, P. 'Hermodoros et Vitruve', *MEFR* 85 (1973) 137-61
397. Gros, P. *Aurea templa: recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à l'époque d'Auguste* (BEFAR 231). Paris, 1976
398. Gros, P. *Architecture et société à Rome et en Italie centro-méridionale aux deux derniers siècles de la république* (Coll. Latomus 156). Brussels, 1978
399. Gros, P. 'La fonction symbolique des édifices théâtraux dans le paysage urbain de la Rome augustéenne', in *A* 96, 319-46
- 399A. Gros, P. and Torelli, M. *Storia dell'urbanistica antica. Il mondo romano*. Rome-Bari, 1988
400. Gross, W. H. *Zur Augustusstatue von Prima Porta*. Göttingen, 1959
401. Gross, W. H. *Iulia Augusta. Untersuchungen zur Grundlegung einer Livia-Ikonographie*. Göttingen, 1962
402. Gusman, P. *L'art décoratif de Rome*. 2 vols. Paris, 1912
403. Hafner, G. *Späthellenistische Bildnisplastik*. Berlin, 1954
404. Hammond, M. *The City in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA, 1972
405. Hanell, K. 'Das Opfer des Augustus an der Ara Pacis. Eine archäologische und historische Untersuchung', *ORom* 2 (Lund, 1960) 33-123

406. Hanfmann, G. M. A. *Römische Kunst*. Wiesbaden, 1964; transl. as E 407
407. Hanfmann, G. M. A. *Roman Art: a Modern Survey of the Art of Imperial Rome*. Greenwich-New York, 1964
408. Hänlein-Schäfer, H. *Veneratio Augusti. Eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers* (Archaeologica 39). Rome, 1985
409. Hannestad, H. *Roman Art and Imperial Policy*. Aarhus, 1986
410. Hanson, J. A. *Roman Theater-Temples*. Princeton, 1959
411. Harden, D. B. (ed.) *Glass of the Caesars*. Milan, 1987
412. Hassel, F. J. *Der Trajansbogen in Benevent. Ein Bauwerk des römischen Senates*. Mainz, 1966
413. Hausmann, U. 'Zur Typologie und Ideologie des Augustus-Porträts', *ANRW* II, 12.2 (1981) 513-98
414. Heintze, H. von *Die antiken Porträts in Schloss Fasanerie bei Fulda*. Mainz, 1968
415. Heintze, H. von *Römische Kunst*. Stuttgart, 1969
416. Heintze, H. von (ed.) *Römische Porträts*. Darmstadt, 1974
417. Helbig, W. *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom I-IV*. 1963-72
418. Hesberg, H. von and Zanker, P. (eds.) *Römische Gräberstrassen*. Munich, 1987
419. Himmelfmann, N. 'Das Hypogäum der Aurelier am Viale Manzoni', *AAWM* 7 (1975)
420. Holland, L. A. 'The shrine of the *Lares Compitales*', *TAPA* 68 (1937) 428-41
421. Holloway, R. R. 'The tomb of Augustus and the princes of Troy', *AJA* 70 (1966) 171-3
422. Hölscher, T. *Victoria Romana*. Mainz, 1967
423. Hölscher, T. 'Zu römischen historischen Denkmälern', *AA* (1979) 337-48
424. Hölscher, T. *Staatsdenkmal und Publikum. Xenia (Konstanzer alt-historische Vorträge und Forschungen)* 9. Konstanz, 1984
425. Hommel, P. *Studien zu den römischen Figurengiebeln der Kaiserzeit*. Berlin, 1954
426. Hönle, A. and Henze, A. *Römische Amphitheater und Stadien*. Zurich, 1981
427. Humphrey, J. *Roman Circuses: Arenas for Chariot-Racing*. London, 1986
428. Inan, J. and Rosenbaum, E. *Roman and Early Byzantine Portrait Sculpture in Asia Minor*. London, 1966
429. Ingholt, H. 'The Prima Porta statue of Augustus. The interpretation of the breastplate', *Archaeology* 22 (1969) 176-87, 304-18
430. Instinsky, H. U. *Die Siegel des Kaisers Augustus*. Baden-Baden, 1962
431. Johansen, F. S. 'Ritratti marmorei e bronzei di Marco Vipsanio Agrippa', *ARID* 6 (1971) 17-48
432. Jones, Stuart H. *A Catalogue of the Ancient Sculptures Preserved in the Municipal Collections of Rome: I. The Sculptures of the Museo Capitolino*. Oxford, 1926; II. *Palazzo dei Conservatori*. Oxford, 1926; repr. Rome, 1968
433. Jucker, H. *Vom Verhältnis der Römer zur bildenden Kunst der Griechen*. Frankfurt, 1950
434. Jucker, H. *Das Bildnis im Blätterkelch*. Olten, 1961

435. Jucker, H. 'Römische Herrscherbildnisse aus Ägypten', *ANRW* II, 12. 2 (1981) 667-97
436. Jucker, H. 'Tulisch-claudische Kaiser- und Prinzenporträts als "Palimpseste"', *JDAI* 96 (1981) 236-316
437. Jucker, H. and Willers, D. (eds.) *Gesichter: Griechische und römische Bildnisse aus Schweitzer Besitz*. Berne, 1982
438. Kähler, H. 'Triumph- und Ehrenbogen', s.v. in *RE* VII A I. Stuttgart, 1939
439. Kähler, H. 'Die Ara Pacis und die augusteische Friedensidee', *JDAI* 69 (1954) 67-100
440. Kähler, H. 'Der Augustus von Prima porta', *Gymn.* 63 (1956) 345-50
441. Kähler, H. *Die Augustusstatue von Prima Porta*. Cologne, 1959
442. Kähler, H. *Der römische Tempel*. Berlin, 1970
443. *Kaiser Augustus und die verlorene Republik. Eine Ausstellung im Martin-Gropius-Bau. Berlin, 7 Juni-14 August 1988*. (No editor stated.) Mainz, 1988
444. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, G. *Ausgewählte Schriften* II. *Römische Bildnisse*, edited by G. Kleiner and H. von Heintze. Berlin, 1956
445. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, G. *Zwischen Republik und Kaiserreiche*. Hamburg, 1961
446. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, G. *Römische Kunst*. 4 vols. Hamburg, 1961-3
447. Kersauson, K. de *Musée du Louvre. Catalogue des portraits romains: 1. Portraits de la République et d'époque Julio-Claudienne*. Paris, 1986
448. Kiss, Z. *L'iconographie des princes julio-claudiens aux temps d'Auguste et de Tibère*. Warsaw, 1975
449. Kleiner, D. E. E. *Roman Group Portraiture. The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and the Early Empire*. New York, 1977
450. Kleiner, D. E. E. 'The great friezes of the Ara Pacis Augustae: Greek sources, Roman derivatives, and Augustan social policy', *MEFRA* 90,2 (1978) 753-85
451. Kluge, K. and Lehmann-Hartleben, K. *Die antiken Grossbronzen*. Berlin, 1927
452. Kockel, V. 'Beobachtungen zum Tempel des Mars Ultor und zum Forum des Augustus', *MDAI(R)* 90 (1983) 421-48
453. Koepfel, G. 'Official state reliefs of the city of Rome in the Imperial age. A bibliography', *ANRW* II, 12. 1 (1982) 480-9
454. Koepfel, G. 'The grand pictorial tradition of Roman historical representation during the early empire', *ANRW* II, 12. 1 (1982) 507-35
- 454A. Koepfel, G. 'Die historischen Reliefs der Römischen Kaiserzeit', *BJ* 183 (1983) 61-144
455. Koepfel, G. 'Die historischen Reliefs der römischen Kaiserzeit V, Ara Pacis Augustae', Pt. 1, *BJ* 187 (1987) 101-57; Pt. 2, *BJ* 188 (1988) 97-106
456. Kraft, K. 'Der Sinn des Mausoleums des Augustus', *Hist.* 16 (1967) 189-206 (= *Kleine Schriften* I (Darmstadt, 1973), 29-46)
457. Kraus, T. 'Das römische Weltreich', in *Propyläen Kunstgeschichte* II. Berlin, 1967
458. Krause, C. 'Rapporti di lavoro', in *Domus Tiberiana: nuove ricerche, studi di restauro*, 73-136. Zurich, 1985

459. La Rocca, E. 'Sculture frontonali del tempio di Apollo Sosiano: notizia preliminare', *BCAR* 87 (1980-1) 57-73
460. La Rocca, E. *L'età d'oro di Cleopatra. Indagine sulla tazza Farnese*. Rome, 1984
461. Lahusen, G. *Untersuchungen zur römischen Ebnstatue in Rom*. Rome, 1983
462. Lambrechts, P. 'Auguste et la religion romaine', *Latomus* 6 (1947) 177-91
463. Lambrechts, P. 'La politique apollinienne d'Auguste et le culte impérial', *NClio* 5 (Mélanges Carnoy) (1953) 65-82
464. Lancha, J. *Mosaïques géométriques. Les ateliers de Vienne*. Rome, 1977
465. Leach, E. W. 'Patrons, painter and patterns', in A 39A
466. Lefèvre, E. *Das Bild-Programm des Apollo-Tempels auf dem Palatin* (Konstanzer althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen 24). Constance, 1989
467. Levi, M. A. 'Il regno degli api e la "domus Augusta"', *PP* 38 (1983) 327-46
468. Licht, K. de Fine. *The Rotunda in Rome*. Copenhagen, 1966
469. Ling, R. J. 'Studius and the beginnings of Roman landscape painting', *JRS* 67 (1977) 1-16
470. Ling, R. *Roman Painting*. Cambridge, 1991
471. Lippold, G. *Gemmen und Kameen des Altertums und der Neuzeit*. Stuttgart, 1922
472. Lippold, G. *Kopien und Umbildungen griechischer Statuen*. Munich, 1923
473. Little, A. M. G. *Roman Perspective Painting and the Ancient Stage*. Kennebunk, ME, 1971
474. Lloyd, R. B. 'The Aqua Virgo, Euripus and Pons Agrippae', *AJA* 83 (1979) 193-204
475. Lugli, G. *La tecnica edilizia romana con particolare riguardo al Lazio*. Rome, 1957
476. Lyttleton, M. *Baroque Architecture in Classical Antiquity*. London, 1974
477. MacDonald, W. L. *The Architecture of the Roman Empire: I. An Introductory Study*, 1965, rev. 1982; II. *An Urban Appraisal*, 1986. New Haven-London
478. McKay, A. G. *Houses, Villas and Palaces in the Roman World*. London, 1975
479. Macready, S. and Thompson, F. H. (eds.) *Roman Architecture in the Greek World*. Society of Antiquaries Occasional Papers, n.s. 10. London, 1987
480. Maiuri, A. *Roman Painting*. Geneva, 1953
481. Mansuelli, G. A. 'El arco honorífico en el desarrollo de la arquitectura romana', *AEA* 27 (1954) 93-178
482. Mansuelli, G. A. *Le ville del mondo romano*. Milan, 1958
483. Mansuelli, G. A. *Galleria degli Uffizi. I ritratti*. Rome, 1961
484. Mansuelli, G. A. *Architettura e città. Problemi del mondo classico*. Bologna, 1970
485. Mansuelli, G. A. 'Programmi funerari e monumentalizzazione suburbana. Esempi di urbanistica romana' *St Romagnoli* 29 (1978) 347ff
486. Mansuelli, G. A. *Studi sull'arco onorario romano*. Rome, 1979
487. Mansuelli, G. A. *Roma e il mondo romano*. 2 vols. Turin, 1981

488. Mansuelli, G. A. 'Forme e significati dell'architettura di Roma nell'età del principato', *ANRW* II, 12. 1 (1982) 212-32
489. Mansuelli, G. A. 'La città romana nei primi secoli dell'impero. Tendenze dell'urbanistica', *ANRW* II, 12. 1 (1982) 145-78
490. Mansuelli, G. A. in *Rasenna: Storia e civiltà degli Etruschi*, 679-713. Milan, 1986
491. Mansuelli, G. A., Arslan, E. A. and Scagliarini, D. *Urbanistica e architettura della Cisalpina romana*. Brussels, 1971
492. Marconi, P. *La pittura dei Romani*. Rome, 1929
493. Maria, S de 'Metodologia per una rilettura dei forni di Roma antica', *Parametro* 20 (1973) 41ff
494. Marini Calvani, M. M. 'Urbanizzazione e programmi urbanistici nel settore occidentale della Cispadana Romana', *Caesarodunum* 20 (1985) 349-73
495. Martin, H. *Römische Tempelstatuen*. Rome, 1987
496. Massner, A.-K. *Bildnisangleichung, Untersuchungen zur Entstehungs- und Wirkungsgeschichte der Augustusporträts (43 v. Chr.-68 n. Chr.)*. Berlin, 1982
497. Mau, A. *Geschichte der decorativen Wandmalerei in Pompeji*. Berlin, 1882
498. Megow, W.-R. *Kameen von Augustus bis Alexander Severus*. Berlin, 1987
499. Memel, R. *Das Odeion*. Frankfurt, 1980
500. Mielsch, H. *Römische Stuckreliefs*. Heidelberg, 1975
501. Mielsch, H. 'Funde und Forschungen zur Wandmalerei der Prinzipatszeit von 1945 bis 1975, mit einem Nachtrag 1980', *ANRW* II, 12. 2 (1981) 158-203, 247-56
502. Mielsch, H. *Die römische Villa, Architektur und Lebensform*. Munich, 1987
503. Mitchell, S. 'Imperial building in the eastern Roman provinces', in F 479, 18-25
504. Möbius, H. 'Sinn und Typen der römischen Kaiserkameen', *ANRW* II, 12. 3 (1985) 32-88
505. Moretti, G. *Ara Pacis Augustae*. Rome, 1948
506. Morricone Matini, M. L. *Mosaici antichi in Italia. Regione prima. Roma: Reg X. Palatium*, 1967
507. *La mosaïque gréco-romaine*. Paris, 1965
508. *Mostra Augustea della Romanità: Bimillenario della nascita di Augusto*. Exhibition Catalogue. Rome, 1938
509. Müller, V. 'The Roman basilica', *AJA* 41 (1937) 250-61
510. Mustilli, D. 'L'arte augustea', in C 12A, 307-77
511. Napoli, M. *Pittura antica in Italia*. Bergamo, 1960
512. Neppi Modona, A. *Edifici teatrali greci e romani: teatri, odei, anfiteatri, circhi*. Florence, 1961
513. Neudecker, R. *Die Skulpturenausstattung römischer Villen in Italien*. Mainz, 1987
514. Neuerburg, N. *L'architettura delle fontane e dei ninfei nell'Italia antica*. Naples, 1965
515. Niemayer, H. G. *Studien zur statuarischen Darstellung der römischen Kaiser*. Berlin, 1968
516. Pallottino, M. *Arte figurativa e ornamentale*. Rome, 1940

517. Pallottino, M. 'Arco onorario e trionfale', s.v. in *EAA* I. Rome, 1958
518. Paribeni, R. 'Le opere pubbliche', in C 12A, 405-13
519. Parra, M. C. 'Per la definizione del rapporto fra teatri e ninfei', *SCO* 25 (1976) 89-118
520. *La peinture murale romaine dans les provinces de l'Empire* (BAR International Series 165). Oxford, 1983
521. *La peinture murale antique* (*Actes du séminaire de Paris 1985*, DAF 10, 1987)
522. Pekáry, T. *Das römische Kaiserbildnis in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft. Dargestellt anhand der Schriftquellen*. Berlin, 1985
523. Peters, W. J. T. *Landscape in Romano-Campanian Mural Painting*. Assen, 1963
524. Phillips, E. J. 'The Roman law on the demolition of buildings', *Latomus* 32 (1973) 86-95
525. Picard, G.-C. *Les trophées romains. Contribution à l'histoire de la religion et de l'art triomphal de Rome*. Paris, 1957
526. Picard, G.-C. *L'art romain*. Paris, 1962; transl. as F 527
527. Picard, G.-C. *Roman Painting*. London, 1970
528. Polacco, L. *Il volto di Tiberio*. Rome, 1955
529. Polaschek, K. *Porträttypen einer claudischen Kaiserin*. Rome, 1973
530. Polaschek, K. *Studien zur Ikonographie der Antonia Minor*. Rome, 1973
531. Pollini, J. 'Studies in Augustan "historical" reliefs'. Diss., Berkeley, 1978
532. Pollitt, J. J. *The Art of Rome (753 B.C.-337 A.D.)*. Sources and Documents. New York, 1966; reissued Cambridge, 1983
533. Poulsen, *Greek and Roman Portraits in English Country Houses*. Oxford, 1923
534. Poulsen, F. *Porträtstudien in norditalienischen Provinzmuseen*. Copenhagen, 1928
535. Poulsen, F. *Römische Privatporträts und Prinzenbildnisse*. Copenhagen, 1939
536. Poulsen, F. *Claudische Prinzen. Studien zur Ikonographie des ersten römischen Kaiserhauses*. Baden-Baden, 1960
537. Poulsen, V. H. *Les portraits romains: I. République et dynastie julienne*. Copenhagen, 1962
538. Rakob, F. 'Römische Architektur', in *Propyläen Kunstgeschichte* II, 153ff. Berlin, 1967
539. Ramage, E. S. 'Augustus' treatment of Julius Caesar', *Hist.* 34 (1985) 223-45
540. *Recueil général des mosaïques de la Gaule*. Paris, 1957
541. Richard, J. C. 'Mausoleum. D'Halicarnasse à Rome, puis à Alexandrie', *Latomus* 29 (1970) 370-88
542. Rickman, G. 'Porticus Minucia', in F 330, 105-8
543. Riemann, H. 'Pons Agrippae', *RE* XXI, 2 (1952) 2455-61
544. Rizzo, G. E. *La pittura ellenistica-romana*. Milan, 1929
545. Rizzo, G. E. 'Le pitture della "Casa dei Grifi"', in *MonPitt* III, vol. Roma I. Rome, 1936
546. Rizzo, G. E. 'Le pitture dell'Aula Isiaca di Caligola', in *MonPitt* III, vol. Roma II. Rome, 1936

547. Rizzo, G. E. 'Le pitture della "Casa di Livia"', in *MonPitt* III, vol. Roma III. Rome, 1937
548. Roccòs, L. J. 'Apollo Palatinus: the Augustan Apollo on the Sorrento base', *AJA* 93 (1989) 571-88
549. Rodenwaldt, G. *Kunst der Antike (Propyläen Kunstgeschichte III)*. Berlin, 1927
550. Rodenwaldt, G. *Kunst um Augustus*. Berlin, 1942
551. *Roman Urban Defences in the West*. London, 1983
552. Roques de Maumont, H. von *Antike Reiterstandbilder*. Berlin, 1958
553. Rowell, H. T. 'Vergil and the forum of Augustus', *AJPb* 62 (1941) 261-76
554. Rumpf, A. 'Römische historische Reliefs', *BJ* 155-6 (1955-6) 122-35
555. Ryberg, I. S. 'The procession of the Ara Pacis', *MAAR* 19 (1949) 77-101
556. Ryberg, I. S. *Rites of the state religion in Roman art (MAAR 22)*. Rome, 1955
557. Ryberg, I. S. 'Clupeus uirtutis', *The Classical Tradition (Studies Caplan)* (1966) 232-8
558. Sadurska, A. 'L'art d'Auguste: progrès, regrès, ou transformation?', in *A* 54A, 70-3
559. Santoro Bianchi, S. 'Alcune riflessioni su scuole e tipologie urbanistiche nell'Italia centro-settentrionale', *Caesarodunum* 20 (1985) 375-92
560. Sauron, G. 'Le message symbolique des rinceaux de l'Ara Pacis Augustae', *CRAI* (1982) 81-101
561. Sauron, G. 'Le message esthétique des rinceaux de l'Ara Pacis Augustae', *RA* (1988) 3-40
562. Schefold, K. *La peinture pompéienne. Essai sur l'évolution de sa signification*. Brussels, 1972
563. Schefold, K. 'Caesars Epoche als goldene Zeit römischer Kunst', *ANRW* I, 4 (1973) 945-69
564. Schmidt Colinet, A. *Antike Stützfiguren*. Frankfurt, 1977
565. Schneider, B. *Studien zu den kleinformatigen Kaiserporträts von den Anfängen der Kaiserzeit bis ins dritte Jahrhundert*. Munich, 1976
566. Schumacher, W. N. *Basilika: Untersuchungen zur antiken und frühmittelalterlichen Baukunst*. Berlin, 1928
567. *Sculture municipali dell'area Sabellica tra l'età di Cesare e quella di Nerone. (Studi Miscellanei 10 (1963-1964))*. Rome 1965
568. Sear, F. B. *Roman Wall and Vault Mosaics*. Heidelberg, 1977
569. Sena Chiesa, G. and Facchini, G. M. 'Gemme romane di età imperiale: produzione, commerci, committenza', *ANRW* II, 12. 3 (1985) esp. 3-31
570. Settis, S. "'Esedra" e "ninfeo" nella terminologia architettonica del mondo romano', *ANRW* I, 4 (1973) 661-745
571. Shipley, F. 'Chronology of the building operations in Rome from the death of Caesar to the death of Augustus', *MAAR* 9 (1931) 17-60
572. Shipley, F. *Agrippa's Building Activities in Rome*. St Louis, 1933
573. Sichtermann, H. 'Gemalte Gärten in pompeianischen Zimmern', *AW* 5 (1974) vol. 3, 41-51

574. Simon, E. 'Zur Augustusstatue von Prima Porta', *MDAI(R)* 64 (1957) 46-68
575. Simon, E. 'Das neugefundene Bildnis des Gaius Caesar in Mainz', *MZ* 58 (1963) 1-18
576. Simon, E. *Ara Pacis Augustae*. Tübingen, 1967
577. Simon, E. *Augustus: Kunst und Leben in Rom um die Zeitenwende*. Munich, 1986
578. Simpson, C. J. 'The date of the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor', *JRS* 67 (1977) 91-4
579. Sjöqvist, E. 'Kaisareion. A study in architectural iconography', *ORom* 1 (1954) 86-108
580. Smith, R. R. R. 'The Imperial reliefs from the Sebasteion at Aphrodisias', *JRS* 77 (1987) 88-138
581. Speyer, W. 'Das Verhältnis des Augustus zur Religion', *ANRW* II, 16.3 (1986) 1777-805
582. Stemmer, K. *Untersuchungen zur Typologie, Chronologie und Ikonographie der Panzerstatuen*. Berlin, 1978
583. Stewart, A. F. 'To entertain an emperor: Sperlonga, Laokoon and Tiberius at the dinner-table', *JRS* 67 (1977) 76-90
584. Strong, E. *La scultura romana da Augusto a Costantino*. 2 vols. Florence, 1923-6
585. Strong, E. *Art in Ancient Rome*. London, 1929
586. Strong, E. 'The art of the Augustan age', in *CAH* x¹ (1934) 545ff
587. *Studi sulla città antica*. Rome, 1983
588. Taeger, F. *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*. Stuttgart, 1957 and 1960
589. Tamassia, A. M. 'La pittura nell'età di Augusto', *Arte antica e moderna* 4 (1958) 319-33
590. Tamm, B. *Auditorium and Palatium. A Study on Assembly-Rooms in Roman Palaces During the 1st Century B.C. and the 1st Century A.D.* Stockholm, 1963
591. Tamm, B. *Neros Gymnasium in Rom*. Stockholm, 1970
592. Technau, W. *Die Kunst der Römer* (Geschichte der Kunst, das Altertum). Berlin, 1940
593. Thompson, H. 'The impact of Roman architects and architecture on Athens: 170 B.C.-A.D. 170', in Macready, S. and Thompson, F. H. (eds.) *Roman Architecture in the Greek World* (The Society of Antiquaries Occasional Papers n.s. 10) London, 1987
594. Thornton, M. K. and R. L. *Julio-Claudian Building Programs, a Quantitative Study in Political Management*. Wauconda, 1989
595. Todd, M. 'Forum and capitolium in the early Empire', in Grew, F. and Hobley, B. (eds.) *Roman Urban Topography in Britain and the Western Empire* (CBA ResRep. 59), 55-66. London, 1985
596. Torelli, M. *Typology and Structure of Roman Historical Reliefs* (Jerome Lectures, 14th Ser.). Ann Arbor, 1982
597. Toynbee, J. M. C. 'The Ara Pacis reconsidered and historical art in Roman Italy', *PBA* 39 (1953) 67-95

598. Toynbee, J. M. C. 'The Ara Pacis Augustae', *JRS* 51 (1961) 153-6
599. Toynbee, J. M. C. *The Art of the Romans*. London, 1963
600. Tram Tan Tinh. *Catalogue des peintures romaines du Musée du Louvre*. Paris, 1974
601. Treves, P. *Il mito di Alessandro e la Roma d'Augusto*. Milan and Naples, 1953
602. Tufi, S. R. 'Frammenti delle statue dei *summi viri* nel foro di Augusto', *DArch* 3.1 (1981) 69-84
603. Vermeule, C. C. *Roman and Imperial Art in Greece and Asia Minor*. Cambridge, 1968
604. Vermeule, C. *The Cult Images of Imperial Rome*. Rome, 1987
605. Vierneisel, K. and Zanker, P. *Die Bildnisse des Augustus. Herrscherbild und Politik im kaiserlichen Rom*. Munich, 1979
606. *La villa romana*. Bologna, 1971
607. Vos, M. de 'Due monumenti di pittura postpompeiana a Roma', *BCAR* 81 (1968-9) 149ff
608. Vos, M. de *L'egittomania in pitture e mosaici romano-campani della prima età imperiale*. Leiden, 1980
609. Walker, S. and Burnett, A. *The Image of Augustus* (British Museum Publications). London, 1981
610. Walker, S. and Burnett, A. *Augustus* (Handlist of the exhibition and supplementary studies) (British Museum Occasional Papers 16). London, 1981
611. Wallace-Hadrill, A. 'The golden age and sin in Augustan ideology', *P & P* 95 (1982) 19-36
612. Ward-Perkins, J. B. 'From Republic to Empire: reflections on the early provincial architecture of the Roman west', *JRS* 60 (1970) 1-19
613. Ward-Perkins, J. B. *Architettura romana*. Milan, 1974 (transl. as *Roman Architecture*. New York, 1977)
614. Ward-Perkins, J. B. *Cities of Ancient Greece and Italy. Planning in Classical Antiquity*. London, 1974
615. Ward-Perkins, J. B. *Roman Imperial Architecture*. Harmondsworth, 1981
616. Wardman, A. *Religion and Statecraft among the Romans*. London, 1982
617. Weinstock, S. 'Pax and the "Ara Pacis"', *JRS* 50 (1960) 44-58
618. West R. *Römische Porträtplastik* 1-11. Munich, 1933-41
619. Wheeler, M. *Roman Art and Architecture*. London, 1964
620. White, P. 'Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome', *Phoenix* 42 (1988) 334-56
621. Williams Lehmann, P. *Roman Wall Painting from Boscoreale in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. Cambridge, MA, 1953
622. Wilson-Jones, M. 'Designing the Roman Corinthian Order', *JRA* 2 (1989) 35-69
623. Winckes, R. *Clipeata Imago. Studien zu einer römischen Bildnisform*. Bonn, 1969
624. Winckes, R. 'Zum Illusionismus römischer Wandmalereien der Republik', *ANRW* I, 4 (1973) 927-44
625. Zanker, P. *Forum Augustum. Das Bildprogramm*. Tübingen, n.d. [c. 1968]

626. Zanker, P. *Forum Romanum. Die Neugestaltung durch Augustus*. Tübingen, 1972
627. Zanker, P. *Studien zu den Augustus-Porträts*, 1: *Der Actium-Typus* (Abh. Gött. Ak. Wiss. 3). Göttingen, 1973
628. Zanker, P. *Klassizistische Statuen. Studien zur Veränderung des Kunstgeschmacks in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Mainz, 1974
629. Zanker, P. *Provinzielle Kaiserporträts. Zur Rezeption der Selbstdarstellung des Princeps*. Munich, 1983
630. Zanker, P. 'Der Apollontempel auf dem Palatin', in F 330, 21-40
631. Zanker, P. 'Zur Bildnisrepräsentation führender Männer in mittelitalischen und campanischen Städten zur Zeit der späten Republik und der julisch-claudischen Kaiser', in E 77, 251-66
632. Zanker, P. *Augustus und die Macht der Bilder*. Munich, 1987
633. Zanker, P. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Jerome Lectures, 16th Ser.) (transl. of 'Augustus und die Macht der Bilder', by A. Shapiro). Ann Arbor, 1988
634. Zazoff, P. *Die antiken Gemmen*. Munich, 1983
635. Zevi, F. *La casa Reg*, IX, 5, 18-21 a Pompei (*Studi Misc.* 5 (1960-1)). Rome, 1964
636. Zinserling, G. 'Der Augustus von Primaporta als offizielles Denkmal', *Acta Antiqua* 15 (1967) 327-39

4. LAW

637. Allison, J. E. and Cloud, J. D. 'The *lex Iulia maiestatis*', *Latomus* 21 (1962) 711-31
638. Astolfi, R. *I 'Libri Tres Iuris Civilis' di Sabino*. Padua, 1983
639. Atkinson, K. M. T. 'The education of the lawyer in ancient Rome', *The South African Law Journal* 87 (1970) 31-59
640. Bauman, R. A. *The Crimen Maiestatis in the Roman Republic and Augustan Principate*. Johannesburg, 1967
641. Bauman, R. A. *Impietas in Principem*. Munich, 1974
642. Bauman, R. A. *Lawyers in Roman Transitional Politics*. Munich, 1985
643. Bauman, R. A. *Lawyers and Politics in the Early Roman Empire: a Study of Relations Between the Roman Jurists and the Emperors from Augustus to Hadrian* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 82), Part 1, chs. 1 and 2. Munich, 1989
644. Brunt, P. A. 'The legal issue in Cicero, *pro Balbo*', *CQ* n.s. 32 (1982) 136-47
645. Buckland, W. W. *The Roman Law of Slavery. The Condition of the Slave in Private Law from Augustus to Justinian*. Cambridge, 1908; repr. 1970
646. Buckland, W. W. *A Textbook of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian*. 3rd edn revised by P. Stein. Cambridge, 1966
647. Cancelli, F. 'Il presunto "ius respondendi" istituito da Augusto', *BIDR* 29 (1987) 5-31
648. Champlin, E. 'Pegasus', *ZPE* 32 (1978) 269-78